The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIX, No. 2 AUGUST, 1948

CONTENTS

Many are Called . . . *William R. O'Connor* 81

The Hospital Chaplain and the Administration of Extreme Unction . . . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 95

Recent Publications on the Psalms. Part I *Edward P. Arbez, S.S.* 105

Doctrinal Missions . . . *Walter Sullivan, C.S.P.* 115

The Ordeal of Father Wall. Part VII *Thomas Owen Martin* 118

Jesus Christ's Revelation of His Messianic Dignity and of His Divinity . . . *Joseph L. Lilly, C.M.* 130

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Bride and Groom at Nuptial Mass 142

The Antiquity of the Genuflection 142

Academic Dress for Monsignori 143

The Ciborium Veil 144

The Baptismal Salt not to be taken home 144

Why a Feast of St. Paul on June 30? 145

Sunday Morning Confessions 145

Lay Participation in the Mass 147

Confirmation Administered by a Pastor 148

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

BOOK REVIEWS

Thinking it Over, *by Thomas F. Woodlock* . . . 150
Where is Truth? *by Elizabeth T. Britt* 151
Bourke Cockran: A Free Lance in American Politics, *by James McGurrin* 152
Natural and Supernatural Wedlock: A Lenten Course of Seven Sermons, *by Rev. Clement H. Crock* . . 153
Old St. Patrick's: New York's First Cathedral, *by Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O.S.U.* 154
The Human Wisdom of St. Thomas, *arranged by Joseph Pieper* 155
Le Cardinal De Berulle, *by A. Molien, Priest of the Oratory* 156
A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, *by Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B.* 158
Introduzione alla psicologia, *by Agostino Gemelli and Giorgio Zunini* 159
BOOK NOTES 160

BUYING cheap merchandise is like stopping the clock to save time, especially when the wares are offered as something "just as good" as the best.

When fabrics are sought for conversion into Sacred Vestments or Altar Draperies, is not the Church worthy of the finest quality the market affords? We realize that every Pastor cannot be a textile expert. His best yardstick in selecting Liturgical Fabrics, therefore, lies in the character and reputation of the manufacturer whose product he purchases. In Church textiles there's only one "Allen". Insist on having your CHURCH GOODS DEALER show you Allen Fabrics and be safe.

"Buy American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS
ALLEN MADE MEANS AMERICAN MADE

ALLEN SILK MILLS
Manufacturers
Charles M. Muench, *Executive Director*
140 West 31st Street **New York 1, N. Y.**
VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS
DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS
Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

MANY ARE CALLED

The best and most effective appeal for vocations that was ever made came from the lips of Christ when He said: "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he send laborers into his harvest" (*Luke* 10:2).

Both in Our Lord's day and in our own, those who have responded to the call are too few in proportion to the amount of work that remains to be done. While it is true that "many are called" to the ordinary graces that lead to salvation and "few are chosen" for special work in the Lord's vineyard, these "few" must not be taken in an absolute sense but only in a relative sense. They will always be few compared with the larger numbers who are not called to labor in some special field for the Lord, but it is surely not the will of the Master that they remain too few to accomplish the task He has assigned them to do. Because the harvest is great, He wants many laborers to gather it in, and for this purpose He calls many, not just a few; although, unfortunately, too few respond to His call.

We should rid ourselves of the notion, then, that, while Our Lord calls many to lead the ordinary life of a Christian in the world, He wants, and therefore chooses, only a few for the work of the priesthood or for the religious life. "Many are called" to be priests and "many are called" to the religious state, for the simple reason that the harvest which these chosen ones are to gather in is very great and it needs many laborers to do justice to the task. It is regrettable that many who are admirably suited by nature and grace to labor in the special vineyard of the Lord are unaware that He is calling them. They never suspect that they may have a true vocation for the priesthood or for the religious life. The number of priests and religious is altogether too small for the work they are called upon to do. We may be sure that God is inviting many to labor for Him in these fields and that He wants many, and not just a few, to heed His special call.

While the vocations to the priesthood and to the religious state are the principal concern of this article, these two special calls will be considered within the framework of all the divine calls that are given to men.

WHAT IS A VOCATION ?

The word vocation means a call. As the term is generally used today, it refers to a call from God, addressed to persons living in the world, inviting them to do something for Him. The kind of vocation one has will depend upon the nature of the call that God gives him. More particularly, it will depend upon the kind of work that God wants men to do for Him in this world.

The divisions of vocation follow upon this basis. First of all, there are general calls and special calls. A general call is either one that is given to a large number of people, or it is an appeal to perform a work of a general character. In the former sense the call to salvation is a general call, since God "will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (*I Tim.* 2:4). In the latter sense the call to exercise our talents and abilities for the glory of God and the promotion of human welfare is also a general vocation, because of the general character of the work to which God is calling.

A special call, from this standpoint, is either one that is not addressed to all but to one or a few, or it is one that has as its object a definite, particular work for God in this world, no matter how many may receive such a call. When God called Abraham to go out from Ur of the Chaldees and be the father of his people, obviously this was a special call addressed to him alone for a definite task. In the same way, Samuel was called to be a prophet of God, and Cyrus was called to bring about the return of the chosen people from their captivity. The call the apostles received was a special vocation, since it was an invitation to do a highly important, particular work for God and it was addressed to only twelve men. The same is true of the call to the priesthood or to the religious life: they are special, not general, calls or vocations mainly because of the type of work to which they invite. Although many may be called to these specialized activities, yet they will always be few in comparison with the vast numbers of men and women who will never receive such a call.

Another division of vocation is into natural and supernatural, depending upon the ultimate aim and purpose of the call. Since God is the author of nature and of natural good, we may be sure that He calls men to do the good for which they are equipped by nature and the special talents which He has given them. This is

what we mean by a natural vocation. It is, for example, God's will that the natural good of marriage be promoted in this world. It is also His will that justice prevail among men, and that the general welfare of individuals and of society be furthered and advanced through specialized human effort. For this reason He may be said to call those who are in a particular state in life to live up to its obligations and to further the good that can be done in and through that state. In this sense marriage is a vocation: those who are married are called to achieve the ends and purposes of this great natural symbol of the union of Christ and His Church. Rulers are called by God to promote the political and social good of civil society. Judges and lawyers have a vocation, which is clearly to promote the ends of justice among men. A physcian, a teacher, a soldier, a business-man, are all called by God to do the good for Him and for society that their particular profession or occupation enables and permits them to do. The circumstances of one's life will be a contributing factor in determining just what his vocation is on the natural plane. Clearly, one who has a nature and talents that equip him to be a physician is not called to do the work of a physician if war or poverty or some other circumstance makes it impossible for him to carry out his natural bent and inclination. Unfortunately, this notion of vocation on the natural plane is too often ignored or denied today. Yet, during the war, at least one peace plan proposed in England contained the statement that the sense of a divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work, if a lasting peace is to be insured.

On the supernatural level vocation consists in a call from God to do something for Him in this world that will lead to salvation in the next. These supernatural vocations may also be general or special. A general supernatural vocation is the call, issued to all men, to accept the grace of God, join His Church, and live in visible union with the Vicar of Christ on earth. This call is not an optional invitation which men may accept or not as they please. It is a command that no one may disregard without peril to his salvation. We are concerned more with special supernatural vocations than with general. In particular, we are concerned with three special vocations: (1) the call to lead a single life in the world; (2) the call to the priesthood; (3) the call to the religious state. These calls are genuine invitations or counsels, and not commands.

THE CALL TO A SINGLE LIFE IN THE WORLD

The vocation to lead a single life in the world is a special supernatural call. This means that when a single state is chosen from a spiritual motive, when it is accepted as a means of giving oneself more completely and undividedly to God, then it is higher than even the married state and it is a true vocation from God. St. Paul teaches this in I Cor. 7:32-34:

> He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God.
>
> But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided.
>
> And the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit. But she that is married, thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

The Church does not teach that the single state, considered in itself and apart from all supernatural or spiritual motivation, is better than the married state. This would be a form of Manicheism that the Church has often condemned. God, however, invites many chosen souls, men and women, to devote themselves to Him and to their spiritual welfare in an undivided way, even though they are living in the world and have taken no vow. These souls may never be called to enter a religious order or to join the ranks of the priesthood, yet they have a true vocation from God and they are especially dear to Him. The state of virginity, with or without a vow, when it is accepted for God's sake, is higher than the married state. It is the supernatural motive that makes it a supernatural and not merely a natural vocation. It is also a special vocation because it is not given to all and the state to which it calls is one of special dedication to God.

It would be well for those who through force of circumstances rather than through their own choice are leading a single life in the world, to remember that they can turn their state into a true vocation in accordance with the designs of divine providence. They do this when they regard their lot as a disposition of the providence of God and accept it in the spirit recommended by St. Paul.

THE CALL TO THE PRIESTHOOD

The call to the priesthood is a special supernatural vocation. This is clear from the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 5:1-4:

> For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins;
>
> Who can have compassion on them that are ignorant and that err, because he himself also is compassed with infirmity.
>
> And therefore he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.
>
> Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was.

It is a special vocation because it is a call to a peculiar task that is not given to all; it is supernatural because of the salutary character of the work God calls the priest to perform.

As God called Saul and Barnabas to the work of the apostolate, so now He calls men to continue the work of the apostles in the world. It is a vocation not so much to a state in life as to a definite function or office in life. Because this office requires sanctity in those who are called to carry on its functions in the world, the priesthood is conferred by means of a sacrament, the great sacrament of Orders that culminates in the episcopacy. Since neither the single life in the world nor the religious life is an office but a state, the state of acquiring perfection, these states do not necessarily presuppose sanctity in those who are called to them and the acceptance of the call is not accompanied by a sacrament. The vocation to marriage in this respect is similar to the vocation to the priesthood. It is a call to a very important function or office in life, an office that needs the grace of God if it is to be carried out successfully and in accordance with the divine will. For this reason the vocation to marriage as well as to the priesthood is accompanied by a sacrament, while entrance into the religious state is not.

In order to discover what the nature of the priestly vocation is, we must examine the work the priest is called by God to do for Him in the world. This work is threefold: first, to offer sacrifice; second, to administer the sacraments; third, to preach the word of God.

The world today needs this threefold mission as much as it ever

did in the past, if not more so. We see men and women either making no sacrifices at all, or else making them in the wrong causes. The priest is called by God to offer true and proper sacrifice and in the right cause. It is his vocation to continue the offering of the one true sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ for the world's salvation. This he does daily in the sacrifice of the Mass. The world little realizes how necessary the priest is for this purpose; for without sacrifice man cannot live, and without true sacrifice he cannot be saved.

Secondly, men and women are sick today, sick in body and sick in soul. Their spirit is weak, their minds are ill at ease. They are hungry for food for the body and still more hungry for food for the soul. Physical sickness saps their bodily strength and brings them to the doors of death; the spiritual sickness of sin saps their spiritual strength and brings them close to the doors of the second death. Here is where the truly humanitarian vocation of the priest is seen at its best. He is called by God to administer to sick humanity the remedies it needs for its spiritual and even bodily health. These remedies are the seven sacraments of the Church. Through the sacrament of Penance he cures the spiritual disease of sin; while through the sacrament of Extreme Unction he prepares the failing minds and bodies, as well as souls, of the sick and dying for immediate entrance into heavenly glory. Above all, when men clamor for bread, it is the sublime vocation of the priest to remind them that not in material bread alone doth man live but in the supersubstantial bread of life that he breaks to them in the Blessed Sacrament of the altar.

Thirdly, men and women today are victims of the word, the spoken and the written word. Propaganda has become a fine art; but we no longer believe the word we hear or read, it has proven false so often. The word of God alone can be believed, for it is truth, and truth is the bread of life for the soul. Men are hungry for the words of salvation, and they want the assurance that only the word of God can give. The priestly vocation includes also the commission to preach this word and to teach all the truths that are necessary for salvation: "Teach ye all nations . . . teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

From this short review of the office and function of the priest in the world, we can see how high, how special, how holy a voca-

tion is the call to the priesthood. It is above all a supernatural call, since it is always accompanied by the grace of God inspiring one to accept it, and the work to which it invites is spiritual in the highest and best sense of the term.

THE CALL TO THE RELIGIOUS STATE

If the vocation to the priesthood is a call to a sacred office or function in life, the vocation to enter a religious order or community is a call to begin living a state of life that is the highest one can live in this world. It is a life dedicated completely and entirely to God by the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. It differs from the priesthood, as we have seen, to the extent that the call to the priesthood is a call to assume an office rather than to live a particular form or state of life. The office of a priest is quite independent of any state in life; it may be exercised by one in the single state that is not technically religious, by one in the religious state, and even by one in the married state. In the east married priests are found exercising their sacred office just the same as celibate priests. In the east and in the west there are priests who are members of religious orders or communities and priests who are not. In the west a celibate priesthood is the rule even for priests who are not members of a religious order.

From what we have seen it is clear that the question sometimes asked: "Which is higher, the priesthood or the religious life?" is not a proper question to ask. It is like asking which is higher, an ambassadorship or old age? Not being in the same class, these two cannot be compared; one is an office and the other is a state of life. Among the functions or offices one can assume in life, the priesthood is certainly the highest. We may compare the ambassadorship of Christ that is borne by the priest with an ambassadorship given by some earthly ruler and say that the former is higher than the latter. We can measure them both by a common standard. Then, among states of life that one may enter and live, the religious state is certainly higher than the married state or any form of a single life that is not also religious. The reason is plain: the religious state is a form of life in which a person is bound and surrendered to God completely by the three vows, and as such it is on a higher plane than all other states that are not so completely dedicated to Him. The office of the priesthood may or

may not be found in conjunction with the religious state, but it has nothing to do with the perfection that is inherent in the state as such.

It follows that a priest who is not a religious has been called to a higher office than the superior of a religious community (e.g. the Christian Brothers) who is not a priest. Yet a lay brother in a religious order is living a higher form of life than a priest who is not a religious. We should discourage comparisons between the priesthood and the religious state as if one were higher than the other. Each in its own order is supreme, but the two are not in the same order, and hence are not properly comparable. A person assumes the office of the priesthood; he enters and lives the religious life; he does best when he does both.

Another difference between the priesthood and the religious state has already been suggested. It lies in the relation each of these calls bears to perfection. The priesthood, because of its high office and sacred duties, requires in advance a degree of sanctity and of perfection that is in proportion to the order that is to be assumed and exercised. This is especially true of the fulness of the priesthood, the episcopacy, which presupposes perfection in the one who takes upon himself the office and duties of a bishop. This is why the various orders leading up to the fulness of the priesthood are given only after a suitable preparation.

The vocation to the religious state, on the other hand, is a call to a form of life in which perfection is to be acquired. A person need not be perfect when he answers this call; in fact, the reason why he answers the call is simply because he wishes to become perfect. There is no better way to do this than by living a life that is completely dedicated to God by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. We have the word of Christ for this: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me" (*Matt.* 19:21).

In the vocation to the religious life, as Christ describes it, we have a call to the highest form of life that can be found in this world. It is an invitation that is extended to men and women, to priests and to those who will never assume the office of the priesthood. Sisters, brothers, priests who are also religious, all form an army of devoted followers of Christ who have chosen the best part,

which shall not be taken from them. In renouncing all things for His sake, they have found a fulness of life that cannot be found by those who have everything except Him. In the various religious orders and communities they will find ample opportunity to make use of the talents God has given them, and even to accept a further call to the high office of the priesthood if they are qualified for it and do not already possess it. One vocation does not exclude the presence of another that is not incompatible with it. In fact there is a multiplicity of vocations, natural and supernatural, even in one person, depending upon the mutiplicity of his talents and the purposes God has in mind in making use of him for His own good ends. This is why religious may be seen serving God as teachers, as nurses, as missionaries; and why priests can be found in the class room, at the editorial desk, or on the radio, as well as at the altar. The religious have the advantage of a common life and a holy rule to help them live up to their obligations and to carry out their arduous duties.

SIGNS OF VOCATION

How do I know if I have a vocation? This is an important question, for, unless I know I am called, how can I answer the call when it comes? Are there any signs that will make known to me where my vocation lies?

In this matter two extremes are to be avoided. The first is in looking entirely to the will of another to decide our vocation. Up to the seventeenth century it happened at times that a son of a noble family was drafted into the priesthood or the religious life, and a daughter was likewise compelled to become a nun. The families wished to make sure of the prestige that would come to them from having a son or a daughter in the church, and they did not hesitate to exercise pressure to accomplish this aim. In these circumstances the call or the vocation was wholly external, for it consisted solely in the parents' will. We can imagine the abuses that flowed from such a system. The Council of Trent legislated severely against compulsory vocations of this kind.

The other extreme was a reaction to this. Under the influence of Quietism in the seventeenth century vocation came to be regarded as something wholly internal. If God wishes to call us, His Holy Spirit will whisper internally in the soul, and we must

wait for this interior call before we do anything. Those who have heard the whisper are called; those who have not heard it are not called. In the case of the call to the priesthood, one who has heard this interior call in his soul or who has felt the aspiration of the Holy Spirit in his heart has a right to ordination which not even the bishop may deny. This view was fairly common up to recent years.

So far as the vocation to the priesthood is concerned, we have an authoritative answer from the Church which enables us to determine with a high degree of accuracy just what the signs of a vocation are. What is said of the signs of vocation to the priesthood may be applied analogously to signs of a vocation to the religious state or to a single life in the world. Canon Joseph Lahitton in France had written a book on the priestly vocation in which he opposed the view that it consists in an internal call of the Holy Spirit. A controversy arose over this book, and the issue was so important that in the year 1912 Pope Pius X appointed a special commission of cardinals to examine the whole question. The conclusions arrived at by this commission, which were endorsed by the Pope, are very important for deciding what the signs of a vocation to the priesthood are and in what that vocation precisely consists.

First of all, the commission ruled out the interior whisper or aspiration of the Holy Spirit, heard within the candidate, as the necessary or ordinary sign of a true vocation to the priesthood. It may be present in some exceptional cases, but it certainly is not the rule.

Then the cardinals listed the qualifications that are required in the candidate and which may be regarded as signs that he has a vocation to the priesthood.

(1) A right intention. One who aspires to the priesthood should do so for the proper motive, which is, in general, to labor as an apostle of Christ for the salvation of souls. A wrong intention would be to take on the office of a priest for the sake of monetary advantage or for social prestige.

(2) A natural fitness. The cardinals pointed out that one must be by nature able and inclined to do the work of a priest. Obviously, if a person were a helpless cripple or a chronic invalid, he would naturally be unsuited for the priesthood. In this

connection we may remark that if a person were naturally inclined towards some other career or profession, such as that of a lawyer, or of a physician, or of a soldier, or to the married state, this can be taken as a sign that, naturally speaking, he is not called to the priesthood. God, however, may overrule a merely natural sign and give some supernatural indication that one who does not seem to be called from a natural standpoint, has, nevertheless, a true vocation to the priesthood or to the religious life. Was not this the case with St. Ignatius Loyola? Yet in the ordinary case we are justified in judging by the ordinary signs.

(3) A supernatural fitness. The commission mentions the grace of God as a necessary prerequisite, and it is grace that brings about the supernatural fitness that must be present in a candidate for Holy Orders. The gifts of grace that one has received and which have led him from baptism to the seminary are all indications in the right direction where there is question of the genuineness of the call. When, through the presence of sanctifying grace in the soul and with the aid of actual graces, a young man sufficiently loves God as to desire to serve Him at the altar, he has a strong indication that he has a true vocation.

(4) Probity of life. The fact that the candidate has led a decent, upright life, that he is honest and can be trusted, that he has no serious vices, that he is a gentleman in the best sense of the term, are all signs in his favor when he offers himself for the burden of the priesthood. It is not necessary that he be a saint, but it is necessary that he strive to improve his character if he discovers any weaknesses that could render him unfit for the priesthood. If no improvement follows, this should be taken as a sign that his vocation lies elsewhere. It is unfortunate that a course in good manners and gentlemanly conduct is not given in the average seminary, either major or minor. It might serve to save some who could be saved and to weed out others who should not go on.

(5) Sufficiency of learning. Normally, a priest before ordination has had eight years of primary schooling, four years of high school, four years of college, and four additional years of specialized training in theology. Often the four years of high school and the first two years of college are given in a minor or in a preparatory seminary. The major seminary includes in its first two years

of philosophy the work of the last two years of college, and the remaining four years are taken up with the study of theology. If a candidate has successfully completed these courses, he has sufficient learning to be a priest. In exceptional cases a person may not have had all these courses, but by private study, under the direction of the diocesan or seminary authorities, he may acquire the sufficiency of learning that is a sign of a true vocation.

(6) The call of the bishop. The five requirements just enumerated are all dispositions which must be present in the candidate before he can be said to have a genuine call for the priesthood. They are not, however, properly speaking, the vocation itself. The vocation must consist in a call. Normally, as we have seen, God does not call through the internal whisper of the Holy Spirit audibly present in the heart or soul. The commission of cardinals makes known the ordinary way in which God calls men to the priesthood: it is through His earthly agent, the bishop of the diocese. When the bishop is satisfied, either by personal knowledge or by report from his seminary staff, that a candidate has the necessary requirements, then he freely calls him to Orders. In this unfettered call of the bishop the vocation to the priesthood formally consists. Materially or dispositively it may be said to consist in the qualifications of the candidate, but these do not formally constitute a vocation; and, as the cardinals are careful to point out, before the call of the bishop no one has a right to ordination. The call of the bishop is the voice of God.

How accurately this teaching corresponds with the teaching of Christ who, at the Last Supper, said to His apostles: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit; and your fruit should remain" (*John* 15:16). If vocation consisted formally in the dispositions or inclination of the candidate, he, and not Christ, would issue the call to the priesthood. It is Christ, however, who calls through the bishop of the diocese and a vocation in the full and proper sense of the term does not exist until he issues that call.

Yet the dispositions of the candidate are very important. The commission of cardinals gave the reason why the bishop issues his call after he is sure these requirements are present in the candidate. They furnish him with a well-founded hope that the candidate may be able to discharge properly the duties of the priesthood and to fulfill holily its obligations. Two obligations in particular are

assumed by every priest of the Latin rite which must be known and freely accepted before ordination. They are the obligation of living a celibate life and the obligation of daily recitation of the divine office. There are other obligations and duties, of course; but these two are important because they directly contribute to the personal sanctity of the priest and to the effectiveness of his ministry.

FREEDOM OF VOCATION

Vocation is free. This means in the first place that it places no external or internal compulsion on the candidate. He must freely choose for himself to accept the call God is giving him to become a priest or a religious. No one should enter the religious life or assume the office of the priesthood simply because someone else wants him to do so. At times a parent or a relative, or even a teacher in school, may exert undue pressure upon a young man to become a priest or a religious, or upon a girl to become a nun. This should never be done. Advice should be sought and taken from those who are qualified to assist in this matter, and they are usually the confessor or the spiritual director. Persons living and working in the world are seldom in a position to act as competent guides when there is question of a priestly or a religious vocation.

Vocation to the priesthood or to the religious life is free in another sense. It is an invitation from God, and not a command. Some calls from God are commands which must be obeyed under pain of sin. The call to salvation or the call to enter the Church are of this character. Besides these commands there are counsels of perfection, which do not as such bind under sin. They are true invitations rather than commands. The vocation to the religious state with its threefold vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience is a good example of a counsel of perfection. The call to the priesthood is another.

In highly exceptional circumstances, of course, such as an express revelation from God or the certainty of the loss of salvation unless one become a priest or a religious, the vocation could be a command. These cases are so exceptional, however, that they may be disregarded so far as the average vocation is concerned. In the ordinary case the call to the priesthood or to the religious life is an invitation that may be refused without sin. A person

may try himself or herself out for a time in a novitiate or preparatory school such as a seminary, and at any stage he or she is free to leave. We should get rid of the superstition of "spoiled priests," as if a person who left a seminary before ordination were marked for life. He has not missed his vocation since he never received one, not having received the call of the bishop to orders.

Neither is it true to make the general statement that a person will lose his soul if he does not assume the priesthood or enter the religious state. This should never be said, and above all it should never be said as a means of stimulating vocations. Besides being false, it will cause scruples to arise, and it can even induce some to become priests or religious who might better have remained in the world and have been content with a layman's call.

When all allowances have been made, the call to the priesthood and the call to the religious life are the two highest forms of special vocation that God gives to men in this world. They who have freely accepted these calls have always the consolation of knowing that the words of Christ in Matt. 19:21 and 29 are directed especially to them:

> If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.
>
> Every one that hath left house or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold and shall possess life everlasting.

It is surely not God's will that these choice blessings be reserved for only a few, but that they be offered to many. When we bear in mind the lament of Christ that the harvest is great, but the laborers few, we are amply justified in asserting that many are called to the priesthood and to the religious life, and not merely a few. They will always be few in comparison with the numbers whose vocation does not lie in these fields, but they should be sufficient for the work that the Lord wants to be done. Because the harvest is great, we should pray the Lord of the harvest that many will respond to His call to labor as priests or as religious in the fields He is pointing out to them.

WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie
Yonkers, N. Y.

THE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF EXTREME UNCTION

"Is any one among you sick? Let him bring in the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith will save the sick man and the Lord will raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." [1] For almost two thousand years the sacramental rite described by St. James has been conferring its healing and strengthening graces on the souls of the faithful entering into the valley of the shadow of death. In a large hospital the administration of Extreme Unction is an event of daily occurrence; hence, the hospital chaplain must be readily conversant with the teachings of the Church and of theologians relative to the requirements for its valid and lawful reception.

The conditions required for the valid administration of Extreme Unction on the part of the subject are quite definite and clear. The recipient must be a baptized person who has attained the use of reason (though at present he may be deprived of it), who is in danger (probable, at least) of death from some cause actually present in his body (sickness, wounds, senility), and has the intention (at least habitual implicit) of receiving Extreme Unction.

The condition which offers the most problems is that which concerns the patient's state of health. Is the sick person sufficiently in danger of death to receive Extreme Unction? That question arises often in the mind of the priest engaged in the work of the sacred ministry, especially in the hospital, where the decision often has to be made rapidly. We must, indeed, be generous in our interpretation as to what constitutes a probable danger of death; yet, we cannot rashly anoint patients merely on the plea that such danger "might be present." In other words, the principle, *sacramenta propter homines,* admits of limitations. For example, a person may not be anointed because he is going to be in danger in a short time, if he is not afflicted with some bodily ailment which is placing him in danger at *present.* Thus, a pregnant woman about to enter the delivery room for a parturition which (accord-

[1] *James,* 5: 14, 15.

ing to competent medical testimony) will involve a risk to her life may not be anointed before the dangerous condition begins. The same principle is applicable to one who is about to undergo an operation for the alleviation of a bodily condition which itself is not a threat to life, though the operation will induce grave danger. In the words of Fr. McFadden:

> A patient about to undergo an operation who is sick but not presently in danger of death from his own condition may not be given Extreme Unction. The mere fact that the operation itself is serious and may place him in danger of death does not justify the administration of the sacrament previous to the operation. Thus a patient with *chronic* appendicitis should not be given the sacrament before an operation for the removal of the appendix.
>
> Similarly, a patient who is not at all sick nor in any way in danger of death, but who consents to undergo an operation which will place him in danger of death is not capable of receiving Extreme Unction. Some blood transfusions, some operations to correct physical deformities through plastic surgery, and some operations for the resetting of dislocated parts of the body would be cases of this type.[2]

Some of the afflictions which justify the conferring of Extreme Unction, according to the same authority, are: ruptured appendix or acute appendicitis (suspected or certain), suspected cancer, gangrene associated with diabetic condition, grave uterine hemorrhage, elampsia.[3] To this list certainly could be added tuberculosis, heart trouble, and pneumonia in the case of an elderly person. On the other hand, a simple case of appendicitis, or pneumonia in the case of a young, robust person, would not seem to call for anointing nowadays, when the treatment of these ailments is so effective and the proportion of casualties so few.

Old age is considered as included under the infirmities that justify the administration of Extreme Unction. This is not to be determined by mere length of years. One person at ninety may be more vigorous than another at sixty. The significance of the axiom, *ipsa senectus est morbus,* is that when a person is so weakened and worn by the general debility which accompanies advanced age that he is likely to pass away suddenly, even though he is not suffering from any specific ailment, he can be anointed.

[2] McFadden, C., *Medical Ethics for Nurses* (Philadelphia, 1946), p. 324.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 326 f.

The theological doctrine that even one who is apparently dead can be anointed, at least for a brief time after all signs of life have ceased, will be frequently applied in a hospital. The most practical general rule would seem to be that if death takes place suddenly (prescinding from the case when the body has been gravely macerated or dismembered) Extreme Unction should be given up to two hours subsequently, and may be given up to three or even four hours; but if death follows a lingering illness these figures should be reduced to one-half hour and one hour respectively.[4]

What can be done by the chaplain for the person who is brought to the hospital dying and unconscious, of whose religious beliefs and affiliation nothing whatever can be discovered? It seems to be a soundly probable view that, if it can be done without scandal or antagonism, this individual can be given Baptism, sacramental absolution, and Extreme Unction.[5] These sacraments are to be given conditionally, the most appropriate condition being: "Si capax es"—the understanding being "If you have all the requirements for the valid reception of this sacrament."

One of the most heartrending occurrences in the sacred ministry is the case of the dying Catholic who will not receive the sacraments, or who refuses to give up a manifest state of sin, such as concubinage or affiliation with a forbidden society. What is to be done if such a hardened sinner has continued in his obstinacy even to his last conscious moment and is now evidently close to death, bereft of his senses? Some theologians teach that even one who has continued to reject the sacraments as long as he was conscious can be absolved and anointed when he has become unconscious.[6] To this I agree if there is reason to believe that the refusal was due, not to contempt of the Church's sacraments but rather to the sick person's conviction that he is not in danger of death or to an unreasonable belief that once he has received the sacraments he is sure to die. But when a dying Catholic refuses the divinely established means of grace because he despises them or because he thinks that he has sinned too grievously to be helped by them, he

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 321; La Rochelle-Fink, *Handbook of Medical Ethics* (Westminster, Md., 1943), p. 261.

[5] AER, CXVIII, 4 (April, 1948), 258.

[6] Cf. Iorio, *Theologia moralis* (Naples, 1947), III, n. 766.

seems to be one of those referred to by the Code when it prescribes: "This sacrament [Extreme Unction] is not to be conferred on those who contumaciously remain impenitent in manifest mortal sin." [7]

On the other hand, very little is required to render it at least probable that the sinner just described has repented. The sign of the cross made by the sick man, or a few mumbled words of prayer—even though these are observed after delirium has apparently set in—would suffice to justify the administration of absolution and Extreme Unction, in accordance with the prescription of the Code: "If it is doubtful [whether or not there is contumacious impenitence in manifest mortal sin], Extreme Unction is to be conferred conditionally."[8] In this case the condition should have reference to the intention of the dying person to receive the sacrament (*si intentionem habes suscipiendi hoc sacramentum*), not to his dispositions (*Si poenitentiam habes*) so there may still be left to the dying sinner an opportunity to receive the graces of the sacrament by its subsequent revival, in the event that he has not at present the required dispositions.[9]

The chaplain need have no hesitation in anointing schismatics and even heretics, when they are dying unconscious, if the circumstances make it possible to do this without causing scandal or hostility. For there is a good probability that such persons have sufficient intention to receive this sacrament, at least in their general desire to make use of the means established by Christ for their salvation.[10] It is hardly necessary to add that the priest must guard against giving the impression that the Catholic Church forces its sacraments on non-Catholics against their will, when they are no longer able to protest.

The chaplain might have some doubt about anointing one who was stricken down in the very act of sin. Yet, according to a good number of distinguished theologians, including St. Alphonsus,[11]

[7] Can. 942.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Iorio, *op cit.*, III, 766.

[10] Cf. Kilker, *Extreme Unction* (St. Louis, 1927), pp. 123-35.

[11] St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis* (ed. Gaudé [Rome, 1909]), VI, n. 732.

Vermeersch-Creusen,[12] and Damen[13] even this poor unfortunate is not to be denied the benefits of sacramental anointing. Such cases come to the hospital chaplain in the form of those who have attempted suicide, those who have been seriously wounded in a bank robbery or in a gangster battle, those dying in a state of intoxication, etc.

A young child offers another difficult case. Often the priest is uncertain whether or not the little one has sufficiently attained the use of reason to render him capable of receiving Extreme Unction. As should be evident to all, we cannot settle this problem mathematically, by conferring the sacrament on all those and only those who have reached their seventh birthday. A normal Catholic child of six years of age (and sometimes even younger) in possession of his senses, can ordinarily be given enough instruction in a short space of time to render him at least probably capable of receiving validly the holy anointing. If the priest is doubtful as to the child's capacity, he can administer the sacrament with the condition: *Si capax es.*[14] Nor should the priest hesitate to anoint with the same condition a Catholic child of six who has been deprived of his senses.

When a convert has been baptized on his deathbed, the priest may be perplexed as to whether or not he should immediately anoint him. For, it might be asked, what effect can be produced by Extreme Unction that has not already been produced by Baptism, which remits all temporal punishment due to sin as well as sin itself? Moreover, Extreme Unction is the complement of Penance —how then can it be given, if Penance itself cannot be received by the newly baptized convert? However, despite such objections, it is certain that Extreme Unction can be given in such circumstances, as was authoritatively declared by the Congregation of the Propaganda on Sept. 26, 1821.[15] The intrinsic reason is that Extreme Unction is not limited in its efficacy to the remission of sin or of its effects; it is directed also to the strengthening and comforting of the soul, oppressed by the sufferings and anxieties that surround the hour of death.

[12] Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome juris canonici* (Rome, 1925), II, n. 226.

[13] Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Rome, 1947), II, n. 547.

[14] Cf. Can. 941.

[15] *Coll. S. Cong. de Prop. Fide* (Rome, 1907), n. 768.

It may happen that a person in grave danger of death is willing to confess and receive Holy Communion but vigorously protests against the administration of Extreme Unction, perhaps because of the strange conviction that he will thus be dooming himself to death. But since it is a disputed theological question whether or not there is a grave obligation to receive Extreme Unction even when one is certainly dying,[16] the priest should not refuse the other sacraments to one in this disposition. However, he should emphatically point out the inconsistency of the sick person's attitude and explain the effects of Extreme Unction, dwelling particularly on its power to benefit the body if received in due time. It is well to note in this connection that the priest attending a dying person has the obligation to inform him of his critical condition if those primarily bound to do so—the relatives and the physician—will not perform this duty. The information need not be communicated bluntly and harshly, or even necessarily in an unqualified form. Even though the priest is aware that humanly speaking there is no hope of recovery, it will usually suffice to say: "There is reason to fear that you are dying." The main objective to be gained is to induce the sick person to receive the sacraments with the proper dispositions before the hand of death strikes him.

The Code forbids the repetition of Extreme Unction in the same infirmity, unless the patient has made some recovery and again lapsed into the danger of death.[17] The difficult case is that of the sufferer from a lingering illness who survives for a considerable length of time after being anointed without apparently any change for the better but with a very gradual decline. This condition may go on for months. Can the sacrament be then repeated, at least when it is evident that the end is fast approaching? The affirmative view seems sufficiently probable to follow on the grounds that morally speaking a new danger of death has now arisen.[18] I would say that if at least three months have elapsed since the anointing, the sacrament may be repeated, even though there has been no apparent improvement, though in such a case I would not claim

[16] Cf. Damen, *op cit.*, II, n. 551.

[17] Can. 940, § 2.

[18] Cf. Genicot-Salsmans, *Institutiones theologiae moralis* (Brussels, 1927), II, n. 423.

that there is any strict obligation to repeat the rite. Often, however, in the case of a long period of dangerous illness there will be at least a few days of notable improvement which certainly will justify the repetition of Extreme Unction within a period shorter than three months.

The legislation and ritual prescriptions of the Church grant various concessions in the mode of administering Extreme Unction for emergencies that may frequently arise. In the first place, there is the statement of the Code that "in case of necessity one anointing suffices, on one sense, or better on the forehead, with the prescribed briefer form."[19] The hospital chaplain will have many occasions to apply this concession. Thus, whenever Extreme Unction is given to one who is only probably alive, this short ceremony should be employed, since the soul may leave the body at any moment. Again, if a patient is about to be taken to the operating room and the doctors are anxious to have as little delay as possible, the brief form can be used. Other occasions would be when a patient is in a state of violent delirium, when there is grave danger to the health of the priest if he remains too long in the room (in the event of a very virulent disease, such as smallpox), when a woman in the course of parturition needs this sacrament and it is advisable that the priest retire from the scene as soon as possible, and when the anointing might cause scandal, as in the case of a dying non-Catholic.[20]

However, the priest should not limit the rite to a single anointing for the sake of his own convenience. The mere fact that the sacrament is being administered in a hospital gives no blanket dispensation from the normal procedure of six anointings. However, as the Code states, the anointing of the feet can be omitted for any reasonable cause,[21] and in a hospital such a cause might be present frequently. If the patient is in a ward where this feature of the ceremony might arouse surprise or derision, or if the sick person is wearings stockings or has some affliction of the feet, or if no woman attendant is present to uncover the feet of a woman patient, the chaplain need have no hesitation in omitting the unction of the feet. But when this anointing can be given without any inconvenience either to the priest or the patient, it would be venially wrong to omit it.

[19] Can. 947, § 1. [20] Cf. Kilker, *op cit.*, p. 378. [21] Can. 947, § 3.

The Code declares that when the single anointing is given, there is an obligation to supply the individual anointings, after the danger has passed.[22] Such a case would occur if the priest uses the short form through fear that the person may die at once, but in a few minutes the immediate crisis passes, though the danger of death still remains. There seems to be no *obligation* to add the other unctions if a considerable length of time has passed. Thus if a patient on his way to the operating room were anointed in the briefest possible manner, the other anointings would not have to be given an hour later, when the operation is ended.[23] However, since some theologians think that the other unctions *can* be supplied as long as the danger of death remains,[24] it would be permitted to add them even after a lengthy interval. As the Holy Office declared in 1917, they should be given absolutely, not conditionally.[25] When a person who is apparently dead has been anointed with the short form, the other anointings should not be supplied (presuming that signs of life do not later appear) for certainly the urgent reason for the short form has not ceased.[26]

The ritual also permits the omission, either wholly or in part, of the prayers that precede the anointing—*Introeat, Oremus et deprecemur, Exaudi nos.* But it is commonly regarded as a grave sin to omit, without a very good reason, all the prayers which should precede and follow the essence of the sacrament.[27] When there is a reason to begin with several unctions, these prayers should be recited afterwards if the circumstances permit.

Since the chaplain is liable to be summoned at any hour of the day or night to administer Extreme Unction, and even a few moments delay may deprive a dying person of this important sacrament, there is, ordinarily, sufficient reason for him to make use of the exception allowed in the Code,[28] and keep the blessed oil in

[22] Can. 947, § 1.

[23] Cf. Genicot-Salsmans, *op. cit.*, II, n. 417.

[24] Cf. Vermeersch, *Theologiae moralis principia* (Bruges, 1927), III, n. 651.

[25] *AAS*, IX (1917), 178.

[26] Iorio, *op. cit.*, n. 778 b.

[27] *Ibid.*, n. 760; Wouters, *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Bruges, 1933), II, n. 580.

[28] Can. 735.

his room, whether it be in a rectory or in the hospital. However, he must regard it as a matter of conscience to reserve the oil in a decent place, under lock and key. It is surely irreverent to keep the oil stock in the drawer of a desk, in the same compartment with a pipe, fishing lines, a broken watch, and other such incongruous objects that accumulate so easily. It is unfortunate that many priests show such little concern for the way in which they keep the holy oils. If the oil is kept in the priest's room, the proper repository would be a special cabinet fastened to the wall and habitually locked. If, however, it is kept in the drawer of a desk or table, a special compartment should be used for this purpose, and nothing else should be kept in it, except perhaps, some other holy objects, such as relics or a pyx. It would be appropriate to have this compartment lined with violet silk.

The chaplain of a large hospital, I believe, would be justified in taking the oil of the sick with him whenever he visits the hospital, even though he has no definite patient to anoint. For even in the course of a routine visit cases may present themselves which call for the immediate administration of this sacrament. Of course this must be regarded as a legitimate exception to the general rule that the priest may not regularly carry the oils on his person when he is not attending a particular case.[29] It should be remembered too, that although the prescribed order calls for the administration of Viaticum before Extreme Unction, a slight reason will suffice to justify the inversion of the order. Such a reason would surely be present if a priest discovers the person in need of Extreme Unction on a visit to the hospital, when it would involve an interval of several hours before he could return with the Blessed Sacrament.

The hospital should consider it a matter of obligation to provide those who receive Extreme Unction while in possession of their senses with some knowledge of the nature, the purpose, and the effects of this sacrament, and the way in which they should dispose themselves to receive it. Two points especially should be stressed—first, this sacrament gives great help toward the patient and courageous endurance of the sufferings that often afflict those in danger of death; it gives comfort and confidence to the soul troubled by the thought of the approach of the judgment; and, according to a considerable number of competent theologians, it

[29] Cf. Kilker, *op cit.*, p. 346.

prepares the soul for the immediate entrance into Heaven, remitting the entire debt of temporal punishment, so that it escapes the punishments of purgatory. Secondly, one of the effects for which Christ instituted Extreme Unction is the restoration of bodily health—an effect, however, which does not follow infallibly and absolutely, but is granted inasfar as God foresees that it will be beneficial for the health of the patient's soul.[30] Such instruction should be given briefly to every individual before the sacrament is conferred, if the circumstances make it possible; and when the chaplain is accustomed to give conferences to the nurses and doctors, an explanation of the theology of Extreme Unction would form a very useful and interesting topic. It would be most fitting to have pamphlets on Extreme Unction available both for the patients and for the personnel of the hospital.

Above all, the hospital chaplain should himself be impressed with the dignity and the efficacy of the sacrament which Our Blessed Saviour intended to bestow an abundance of special graces on His faithful followers during their last earthly hours. The priest should never confer this sacrament in a hurried, thoughtless manner, for, however accustomed he may be to administer the last anointing, it is an event of tremendous importance to the recipient. Hence the priest should strive to give this sacrament with the realization that he is taking the place of the gentle, loving Christ in aiding a soul to pass safely from time to eternity.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[30] *DB*, 909.

MISSION INTENTION

"For the Catholic bishops and clergy in Japan" is the Mission Intention for the month of August, 1948.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON THE PSALMS

PART I

The following articles are meant as a survey of some recent Catholic works on the Book of Psalms: Fr. Frey's *My Daily Psalm Book;* Monsignor Knox, *The Psalms: a new translation;* Fr. C. Lattey's *The Psalter in the Westminster Version,* and the recent French translation of Fr. Bea's *Le nouveau psautier latin.* The last named work is an essay on the origin and character of the new Roman translation of the psalms. The other works are English versions of the text of the psalms differing considerably among themselves. Our task will be to appraise those publications.

We begin with the latest arrival, Fr. Frey's *My Daily Psalm Book,* the Book of Psalms arranged for each day of the week (New English translation from the New Latin Version [Brooklyn: Confraternity of the Precious Blood, 1947]). This is a compact little volume of 368 pages, costing only sixty-five cents, a practical pocket edition convenient to carry around as the prayer book which it is intended to be. It is printed on good paper in clear type making it easy to read. Most of the psalms, and in the case of the longer psalms, each of the divisions adopted in the Roman Breviary, are accompanied by fine illustrations, reduced considerably from the originals, yet sufficiently clear in general. These are due to an Oriental artist, Mr. Ariel Agemian, who deserves our sincere congratulations on his excellent work. As remarked by the editor, this is the first time that the entire Psalter appears with illustrations. We should feel grateful to the late Msgr. Stedman, who conceived the idea and engaged the services of the artist in the hope that this would add greatly to the beauty of the work he had planned.

The book begins with a letter from Fr. Aug. Bea, S.J., Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The letter, however, is not a recommendation of this particular English version. It deals in general terms with the value of the psalms as a book of prayers, from which the Christian faithful, like the people of Israel of old in their tribulations, may derive strength and consolation in their present needs. What is commended therefore is the religious use of the psalms—a matter on which we are all agreed. The same idea, the religious value of the Psalter, is developed briefly by the editor in his Foreword (pp. vi-ix). Fr. Frey adds, quite correctly, that

the Psalter is a perfect companion volume to the Missal. He declares also that the new edition should prove especially valuable to priests and religious. "We feel confident it will fill a great need and help tremendously toward a better appreciation of the Breviary and its devout recitation. It should prove a very helpful companion volume to the Breviary" (p. viii). To what extent this optimism is justified will appear from our examination of the text of the new version.

The psalms are reproduced in the order of the Roman Breviary. Since the original project of the late Msgr. Stedman—a translation of the Breviary—apparently has been abandoned, for the present at least, there was no cogent reason to follow the order of the Breviary. Excepting some few individual cases, there is no evident correspondence between the contents of the psalms and the days to which they are assigned. Another arrangement, based on the contents, could have been as satisfactory at least in a prayer book. However, this is a matter of quite secondary importance on which we need not waste time. But since the editor chose to follow the Breviary, we would naturally expect to find Psalm 94, the Invitatory which begins the Divine Office, at the beginning rather than the end of the Psalter (pp. 359 f.) just before some of the Canticles. We would also expect the entire contents of the Psalter to be given. It is therefore surprising not to find several of the "Canticles." The index (p. 368) mentions just a few of them. The Canticle of the three youths (*Daniel,* 3) and the Canticle of David, forgotten in the index, will be found on p. 16 and p. 75 respectively. But we miss altogether *Exodus,* 15; *Deuteronomy,* 32; *1 Samuel* (*Kings*) 2:1-10; *Isaias,* 12:1-6 and 38:10-20; and *Habacuc,* 3. No explanation is given of these strange omissions of texts which deserve a place in a popular translation of the Psalter just as much as the other texts.

Fr. Frey's edition gives us the bare text of the psalms, without any note under the text or at the end of the book. This may be justified by appealing to the popular character of the work, intended moreover to serve exclusively as a prayer book. Yet, there would be nothing incongruous in a prayer book with notes—in an appendix—which would help the reader to understand better the text of his prayers. For in spite of the general excellence of the Latin text on which this English version is based, there are many allu-

sions and statements in the ancient psalms that are bound to puzzle the reader. After all, we wish to understand our prayers, and not to be guided by mere feeling based possibly on a misunderstanding (cf. *1 Cor.*, 14:15).

In the absence of such helps, it would have been wise to make available to the reader whatever other helps are offered by the Latin edition, even—in part—by the liturgical edition of the text. One such help on which the original translation dwells is the practical character of the psalms: *formae poeticae observatio ad sacra carmina rite intelligenda et gustanda plurimum juvat.* Hence the text is printed according to the laws of parallelism, in poetical lines, which force upon the reader's attention the fact that the psalms are poetical compositions. True, the liturgical edition—unfortunately—does not print the new text in parallel lines, no doubt for purely practical reasons—to save space, but this is most regrettable, even if regarded as necessary. But the same necessity did not apply to this prayer book edition. Nor can it be said that the poetical form could or should be disregarded in a popular prayer book: one may pray in poetry as well as in prose.

Another feature, preserved even in the liturgical edition, is the division into strophes or, at least, into sense groups of verses. In the *Liber psalmorum,* the spacing makes this clear; in the liturgical edition, a dash (—) marks the divisions. Thereby the reader is enabled to follow more correctly the development of the thought. The translator should not ignore this feature so valuable for the sense (cf. *Lib. psal.* p. xxviii).

The titles prefixed to their text by the Roman translators are another help to the understanding of the psalms, for those titles condense in a few words the theme of the poem, and thus give to the reader the point of view from which the psalm should be read. The titles therefore should be worded carefully, especially when no other help is given. Now the editor of *My Daily Psalm Book* supplies the reader with titles which, at times, are incorrect or misleading, and, in several instances, fail to take into account the historical circumstances of the psalms; yet, it is upon the historical background of the psalms as a solid foundation that we must base the religious use of the text. Else we are exposed to the danger of making fanciful applications of the sense. Thus Psalm 76 (p. 235) is called: "Thanksgiving for victory over temptation." This may be

a good personal, subjective application, but it certainly cannot be regarded as corresponding to the theme of the inspired poet. The psalmist rather has in view the invasion of 701 under the Assyrian King Sennacherib.[1]

Psalm 113 A and B (p. 49) is called: "Deliverance from the Bondage of Sin." In fact, as could be learned from the explanation in the *Liber psalmorum* (pp. 239 ff.) we have here two poems of entirely different character and contents: vv. 1-8 describe the miracles of the Exodus: this, of course, may be regarded as a figure of spiritual deliverance, from sin, for instance; but the other part, vv. 9ff., develops an entirely different theme, the greatness and goodness of God. Another similar case is to be found in Psalm 73:1-9 (p. 230) which is entitled: "An Act of Reparation." This part of the psalm, which in fact includes vv. 1-11, describes the enemy's acts of profanation of the Temple, and thus gives the historical occasion of the psalm. Fr. Frey's title here misses the point altogether. Most surprising is the title given to Psalm 136 (p. 241): "Homesick for Heaven." For an imprecatory psalm, this supposes quite a "sublimation," and an extraordinary dose of good will on the part of the reader.

Needless to add other examples of titles supplied by the editor which fail to correspond to the real contents of the psalms. The translator would have been better advised if he had simply adopted the titles of the *Liber psalmorum,* and suggested the suitable religious application flowing from the actual contents. Evidently the Christian use of those ancient texts requires some adaptation, but, what is needed is an adaption based on the real sense, not a transformation.

The preceding remarks are concerned with matters which do not affect the translation itself and may therefore be regarded as of secondary importance. We come now to the version itself and examine it as a rendering of its Latin original. Does it keep its promise to priests and religious (p. viii)? To answer our question, we will take some examples from the different parts of the work. As will appear from these examples, we have in several places misunderstandings due to insufficient attention to the Latin text, mistakes which could have been avoided by recourse to the original

[1] For the historical background of this and related psalms (43, 45, 47), cf. Juan Prado, *Sefarad,* VI, (1946), 219-36.

sources of the Latin or simply by consulting the notes of the *Liber psalmorum*. Evidently the lapses of the translator are far from being equally serious. In most cases, the general sense is not affected, so that the reader unable to use the Latin will find in this edition a text enabling him to understand the thought of the Psalmist, far better than would be possible if he used the old Douay version. But our question is whether we find in his new translation the help promised by the author. Or do we find in his work only what any reader of the Psalter—in its new form—who has had the usual training in classical Latin and some experience of Church Latin, can work out for himself without much trouble, especially if he has recourse to the original edition of the *Liber psalmorum?*

In the *Magnificat* (v. 55) we read: "even as *he spoke* to our fathers" in the *Benedictus* (v. 70): "as *he promised.*" Yet in both places the *Latin* has: "sicut locutus est," and the Greek has the same phrase in both cases. There is no reason for the variation. The sense is "as he had promised," but since Biblical Hebrew has no special word for "to promise," it uses "to speak," which will take on the meaning "to promise," in the context. The Greek Bible follows the same usage.[2]

Again in the *Magnificat* (v. 55), Fr. Frey renders: "even as he spoke *to* our fathers *to* Abraham and *to* his posterity forever." The difference between the new Latin (sicut locutus est *ad* patres nostros, *erga* Abraham) and the old text[3] was enough to make clear the sense intended by the Roman translators: "as he had promised to our fathers, *in favor of* (*for, etc.*) Abraham. . ." though this leaves open the choice between two constructions: "(54^b) mindful of his mercy (55^a)—as he had promised to our fathers—(55^b) towards Abraham. . ." and "(54^b) mindful of his mercy, (55^a) as he had promised to our fathers (55^b) in favor of Abraham." Indeed the general sense remains the same, but the question is whether the shade of meaning conveyed by the original is rendered with sufficient accuracy.[4]

[2] Cf. Joüon, *L'Evangile de Notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ* (Paris, 1930), pp. 290 f.; also Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Dictionary* (1906), p. 181 A.

[3] Even in the old version, the sense was clear. The new text only brings out the sense more definitely.

[4] Cf. Joüon, *op. cit.*, p. 291; cf. the modern translations, e.g., J. B. Cabot (1911), Go ıbillon, O. P., *Evangile selon S. Luc* (1945), Buzy (1937), *The Confraternity Edition,* (1941).

Again in the *Benedictus* (v. 71), the text reads: "*salvation* from our enemies. . ." This follows the old version (*salutem* ex inimicis nostris), instead of the new translation: *ut liberaret* nos ab inimicis. . . *to deliver* us (cf. v. 72: *to show* mercy).[5] In the same Canticle (v. 78) we have: "because of the loving-kindness of our God wherewith *the Orient* from on high will visit us." Nothing has been done to clarify the sense of a phrase which has puzzled more than one reader. The note of the *Liber psalmorum* (p. 347) should have helped the translator to adopt a rendering conveying a clearer sense: something like "*the Light,*" a designation of the Messias. In doubtful cases, the translator, of course, must make up his mind regarding the probable sense of his text and render accordingly, instead of simply transcribing the original. Likewise in v. 68 "because he has visited and wrought redemption for his people" follows the peculiar text too slavishly: it leaves the first verb up in the air. The sense can be rendered much more simply, "because he has visited and redeemed his people" or, a little more literally: "because he has visited his people and wrought their redemption."

In the *Dimittis* (v. 32) "a *light of revelation* to the Gentiles" fails to do real justice to the original. Literally it would be: "unto *unveiling* in favor of the nations," i. e. removing the obstacle which prevents them from seeing the truth. The sense may be expressed more clearly by saying for instance, "a light *to enlighten* the nations."

The Canticle of Judith (16:15-21; Gk. 13-17) has a sentence (p. 170) which will not strike the reader as particularly clear: "because every sacrifice having a sweet odor is small, and very small to thee is all the fat of a burnt offering" (v. 19/16/). The sense is sufficiently clear in the *Liber psalm.,* taking the note into account: external religion manifested in the most costly sacrifices does not suffice. It should not be difficult to find a more suitable rendering. At the end of the same verse, we read: "but he who fears the Lord shall be great *everywhere.*" The Latin *undique* may be indeed translated *everywhere,* though this would be rather *ubique.* But if we consult the Greek text, we find that the word means—as does also the Latin word, as may be seen in a Latin dictionary—"*altogether*" "*in every way.*" This is the meaning that suits our text here.

[5] Cf. Joüon, *op. cit.,* p. 293.

In the Canticle of Ecclesiasticus (cap. 36), v. 4 is rendered: "as in their sight thou didst show thyself holy *among* us, so in our sight show thyself glorious *among* them" (pp. 326 f.). The translation is somewhat clumsy—as it is again in v. 11 due to excessively literal adherence to the Latin—but the sense of the Latin is clear. It is, as in similar passages of Ezechiel, that God revealed His holiness by punishing the sins of His people, and He is asked to manifest His glory by chastising the nations. Here also it would have been easy to find a simpler and clearer form. We should read at least: *in* us, *in* them, that is: in our (their) case, *not among* us. . .them. Fr. Frey translates v. 13^{b}: "grant them an inheritance as in the days of old." The rendering is too vague. The thought is clear: the full restoration of the Chosen People in the Promised Land, something very definite. This could be expressed by reading: "and give them their land (or: their inheritance) as of old."

The shortcomings just pointed out in the Canticles appear also in the psalms themselves: unsatisfactory rendering of words, of tenses of verbs; a paraphrastic tendency in places which does not help the sense; insufficient grasp of the sense due to neglect of the helps in the notes of the *Liber psalmorum*. It is not necessary to enumerate all the cases in detail as if we were preparing another edition of the work. Some illustrations will suffice. Psalm 126 (p. 143) 1^{b}: "unless the Lord *protects* the city, the *guard* keeps watch in vain." To correspond more clearly to the Hebrew, the Latin here has words of the same origin. An effort should be made to reproduce this feature in English. V. 2: "for even in the hours of sleep he generously provides for his beloved ones." This might do in a note if it were felt necessary to paraphrase the thought. A straightforward translation of the words would be more forceful and just as clear. Psalm 125 (p. 142) v. 3: the Lord has done great things for us: we *are* glad." Taking for granted the view of the psalm accepted by the Roman translators with many other critics, and their grouping of the verses, the text supposes the return from the Babylonian Captivity: it was something so wonderful that they could hardly believe in its reality: it was like a dream (v. 1^{b}). The event brought great joy to all. This is the thought developed in vv. 1-3 which look back on the *past*. Hence the verbs must be past tenses: the Lord *did* great things—we *were* glad. The second part of the poem contrasts the sombre realities of the present with

the high hopes of the past, and is a prayer for the completing of the restoration.

Psalm 92 (pp. 12 f.) v. 3: "the floods *rise,* O Lord, the floods *lift up* their voice": the Latin, adhering closely to the Hebrew, has the same transitive verb in both places. We have here a figure of style intended to convey, as explained by Fr. Bea (*Le nouveau psautier latin,* p. 177) referring to this text, an impression of the rushing of the mighty waves towards the shore in unbroken succession. Fr. Frey's translation pays no attention to this literary feature. Psalm 117 (pp. 20 ff.) v. 13: *"I was pushed";* this is correct. It agrees with the past tenses of the preceding verses (10 ff.) which describe the attempts of Israel's enemies in the past. We should then naturally have the same form in v. 18 which sums up all those past experiences: "the Lord *chastised. . . he gave me not over. . .*rather than: has chastised, has not given me over. Psalm 47 (p. 153) v. 3[a] "His holy mountain, a dazzling height, it is the joy of the whole world." Neither the Latin nor the Hebrew really suggests the idea of *dazzling,* at least as the word is defined in English dictionaries. 3[b]: "Mount Sion, on *the northern slope,* is the city of the great King." The translator takes the phrase as a geographical designation—not very clear, in any case—as is done by several authors. But how does his rendering represent the Latin: *aquilo extremus?* The phrase is certainly difficult and, as may be seen from the commentaries, different views may be defended. But in the present case, the note of the Roman translators could have helped the editor. They understand the phrase in the light of Assyrian mythology which placed the abode of the divinity in the North. If the psalmist had expressed his thought in terms of Greek mythology, he would have spoken of Mount Sion as the true Olympus, the abode of the great King—another Assyrian phrase used by the Psalmist here.[6]

Psalm 48 (pp. 155 f.) v. 8[a]: *"for* no one can redeem himself, nor pay to God the price of his redemption." The translator seems to have been misled by the Latin: *neque* enim *quisquam liberabit seipsum.* He gave to *enim* its ordinary meaning, without considering whether this suited the context. Here again the textual note in the *Liber psalmorum* would have cleared up the problem. It warns the

[6] For this view, besides the *Liber psalmorum* (p. 88), cf. Boylan, also Sutcliffe, S. J., *The Old Testament and Future Life* (1946), pp. 54 and 58 n.

reader that the Hebrew has been corrected here. The Roman editors tell us that they read the Hebrew particle *AKH*—here translated *enim*—which means: *surely, no doubt. . .* The Latin, as will appear from Latin dictionaries, has exactly the same meaning, so that it should be rendered: *"truly* (verily, indeed, etc.) no one can redeem himself." The second part of that same verse: "nor pay to God the price of his redemption" could be translated more briefly: "nor pay to God *his ransom.*" In the same psalm, v. 12, the use of the passive tends to weaken the sense: "though lands are named after them." It is the foolish wealthy men who have given their own names to their estates, but though their names survive, the men themselves are in their graves, helpless for ever. Hence it would be preferable to translate: "though they called lands (estates) after their (own) names."

It would serve no good purpose to multiply similar cases of more or less important blemishes. Enough has been said to show that the new edition does not contribute anything of special value from the point of view of priests and religious. Their knowledge of Latin will enable them to read the new Latin text of the Psalter intelligently and with profit. If they wish to penetrate more deeply into the sense, literal and spiritual, they must still use other works, which will help them to ascertain the literal sense of the psalms by a good analysis of their contents and by notes clearing up particular passages: such a work is, of course, the *Liber psalmorum* itself. This work, however, does not go into the matter of the spiritual religious use of the psalms. If one needs help for this, it will be found in some such work as the one promised by Fr. Juan Prado in *Sefarad* VI (1946), p. 235: an edition of the psalms provided with exegetical notes, and also with an ascetico-theological commentary. A work of that kind will supply the solid foundation upon which theology and piety can edify themselves.

To conclude, knowledge of Latin, even a good knowledge of Latin, does not of itself give competence to translate the new Psalter, any more than it would enable one to undertake a translation of the Latin classics. Much else is required to fit one for the task. Indeed we have in the new Latin text of the psalms an excellent work, vastly superior to the old text, and quite intelligible to Latin students. Nevertheless, if one wishes to do serious work on the psalms, and particularly to translate them, one will

still need the knowledge of the original languages and acquaintance with the problems of the text in order to avoid the numerous pitfalls, even only to appreciate fully what the *Liber psalmorum* gives us in its notes, textual and exegetical.

To be continued.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the August, 1898, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, by Abbé Hogan, S.S., is another contribution to his fine series on *Clerical Studies.* This article is concerned with the study of the Fathers by priests and seminarians. The author makes a happy remark when he says: "It is well that, before entering on his duties, the young priest should have formed some kind of direct acquaintance with the Fathers. Even a taste of them may beget a taste for them." . . . Another installment of *My New Curate* (the author, Canon Sheehan, still retaining the anonymity of "An Irish Parish Priest") occupies fifteen pages of this issue. . . . Dr. Stang, of Louvain, gives the history of the law of clerical celibacy and presents the arguments for the fitness of this feature of ecclesiastical legislation. . . . Fr. R. Middleton, S.J., writing from England on "The Obligation of Veracity," makes the statement: "Knowledge, which, if revealed, would injure another in person, property, or good name, constitutes a natural secret, which it is of *obligation* to keep, even by a denial of the truth or of our knowledge of it, when this is the only means of doing so". . . . A discussion in the Conference section on the possibility of receiving a dispensation from the eucharistic fast makes it clear that such dispensations were then very difficult to obtain, especially in the case of a priest who desired to celebrate Mass after breaking his fast. . . .Commenting on the faculty granted to priests in missionary countries to say Mass without a server *in case of necessity,* an anonymous writer asserts that this privilege may be used only when otherwise Mass would have to be omitted. . . . In the answer to a question about the practice of hypnotism it is stated that this procedure as a remedy for bodily ailments should be discouraged, because it constitutes a physical as well as a moral danger to the subject.

F. J. C.

DOCTRINAL MISSIONS

James Thurber has remarked that the only man who can be moderately happy to-day is a man who takes joy in confusion. This observation on contemporary life from a professional humorist was soberly echoed by an able philosopher lecturing at the University of Chicago, who stated without qualification that the most obvious characteristic of our age is confusion. Adding to this confusion, if not indeed causing it, is the contemporary mania for advertising, coupled with an extraordinary genius in the manipulation of propaganda. Demands upon attention and intrusions into a man's privacy are made incessantly by supersalesmen with inspired messages and stupendous products. These insistent, sometimes inhuman, and always spectacular cries for attention have jaded our senses and almost robbed us of our faculty for wonder. Yet it is to this same average modern man, shouted at, heckled, and badgered on all sides, that we must preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps it is the acute awareness of the chaotic thinking of the times that has caused a large number of priests to belittle or at least neglect old methods, and has led them to seek and to advocate entirely new methods in approaching the modern mind for the purpose of making converts. It is not the intention of this brief article to quarrel with new approaches to the old problem of attracting souls to the Faith. This is merely a plea not to dismiss methods that have been found excellent in the past, and are still feasible and successful to-day. It may not be the easiest thing imaginable to prevail upon high-strung moderns to attend the services of a "doctrinal mission," but it can be done. One may not be able to fill a large church with eager non-Catholics searching open-mindedly for the truth, but usually they will come in sufficient numbers to warrant the attempt.

"Trailer missions" have for some time past gripped the popular fancy. They are still much in favor today, and deservedly so. Yet when one considers the initial investment of the trailer, the energy with which the work must be pursued, and the meagerness of the increment to the Faith, one is constrained to wonder why trailer missions are in such excellent standing, and the old doctrinal missions, or missions for non-Catholics, so neglected. I do not contend that trailer missions ought to be abandoned, but

merely that non-Catholic missions in our established Catholic churches should not be neglected. Some may object, and say that they are not neglected! No? How many pastors schedule them at all? How many pastors schedule them year after year as a normal procedure?

It appears to this writer that one of the chief reasons why doctrinal missions are not tried more frequently is that pastors generally expect too much, and are not satisfied with a modicum of success; furthermore pastors are rarely willing to gamble with failure, or apparent failure. I have seen a Christian Science service take place in an army chapel with an attendance of two soldiers. If only two non-Catholics were to attend a doctrinal mission, it could still be a success.

Occasionally there are pastors who fear the resentment that may be aroused among non-Catholics. Personally I know of not a single instance in which this has occurred. It is certainly morally unjustifiable and definitely a mistaken apologetical approach to lure non-Catholics into attending a doctrinal mission with the promise that they will not be insulted or offended; and then after they arrive, proceed to heap vituperation upon their unsuspecting heads. But on the other hand it places no strain upon courtesy to explain to them in an honest and friendly manner why we Catholics believe as we do, and wherein we differ from our separated brethren. If some rabid minority does shout and rage or even threaten (unlikely in the extreme) we have the injunction of Christ to preach the Gospel to every creature. People have died for the Faith.

Some may be disposed to envision a mission for non-Catholics as something hopelessly involved and complicated and costly beyond the means of the average parish. But on the contrary, non-Catholic missions are easy to advertise and to conduct and they occasion no exorbitant expenditure. It would seem altogether practicable to follow nearly every Catholic mission with a doctrinal mission of at least five days, devoted to an explanation of the Faith, and especially suited to the needs of interested non-Catholics. Catholics would also benefit greatly by such a mission and should naturally be invited and urged to attend. If the doctrinal mission were advertised during the preceding weeks (and the missionaries, you may be sure, will bend every effort to this end), there is every possibility that the attendance at the

doctrinal week will exceed any other week. If the parish is unable to afford a stipend let the mission be given without one. *Deus providebit!*

All this may seem trite, obvious, unspectacular; and it truly is. But it is neglected. I have heard priests draw vivid word pictures of spectacular meetings planned in behalf of the Faith. I should like to have the spectacular plans materialize. In the meantime it might be well to do the thing that is easy to do. Maybe it is the fault of the missionaries. Maybe if we could bring ourselves to say to a pastor, "After the Catholic mission let us announce a mission for non-Catholics. Just let us borrow your church, and we'll be satisfied if only a handful comes." If this were to be tried on a large scale we might be surprised at the magnitude of the result. It is not a complete remedy for our confused times, but it might help some out of chaos into the light of God's truth.

WALTER SULLIVAN, C.S.P.

Paulist Mission House
Detroit, Mich.

IN THE HOUSE OF GOD

Holiness belongs to the house of God, in order that His place which has been established in peace may have a peaceful worship with suitable respect. Therefore, let entrance to the churches be humble and devout. Let there be in them silent prayer, pleasing to God, undisturbing to those contemplating, and instructive and refreshing to those meditating. Let those assembling there extol by a show of special reverence the name which is above every name, than which there is no other given under heaven to men, in which those believing shall be saved, the name of Jesus Christ, who saved His people from their sins; and what is written that, "in the name of Jesus every knee should bow," let them carry out in themselves, especially during the celebration of holy Mass, and whensoever that name comes to mind let them bend the knees of the heart, which reverence they may manifest by an inclination of the head.

—Canon 25 of the Second Council of Lyons (1274).

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

Part VII

Slumped in his big leather chair, Fr. Wall stared vacantly at the letter in his hand. So this was the reward for years of faithful service. Bounced without a chance to explain. Sure, they said that he had a month in which to answer, but what chance did a man have when he was asked to resign? This was the end. Why hadn't the Bishop investigated before taking this step? He had always thought the man was a careful and prudent administrator, but here he had gone off the deep end without so much as consulting him, Fr. Wall. That was what a lot of vicious wagging tongues could do, cut the ground right from under a man and leave him helpless.

If there were any way to do it, he'd fight this thing. There must be some justice somewhere. Of course, you couldn't do much against the Bishop, he had you no matter what you might want to say, but he sure would like to put up some kind of a defense. Of course, when they came along with that soft invitation to resign, that sort of stymied you right at the start. There wasn't much you could do to fight against a thing like that. Now, if they'd made some charge, you could carry the matter up, and maybe even win, though it would be awfully hard.

Maybe he should get around and see some of the people in the parish. There would be some, certainly, who would be ready to demand that the Bishop keep him in the Jordan parish. That other clique which wanted him out, they would not have so many on their side, certainly not enough to beat the number that he could rally to his side in case of a fight about the matter. He'd see about that. Not tonight, somehow tonight he felt just too washed-up to consider building a back-fire, even though it would take a lot of hard work to make it effective before the month they had given him was up.

Who could be behind this, anyway? Was it that Chancellor? It probably was. Sitting there in that office of his, looking smug, and figuring out ways to get a fellow who was working hard out in his parish. Sure, he could get anyone he went after. It would not be hard. There he was, seeing the Bishop every day and all he

had to do was drop a little word here and another little word there and pretty soon he could smile self-satisfiedly to himself as he notarized a letter from the Bishop telling a man to resign.

Fr. Wall went carefully back over his past relations with the Chancery Office and for the life of him he could not recall when he had ever said or done anything which would turn the Chancellor against him. He had tried to be so careful in all his correspondence and he had had his guard up every time he had been in the Office. It just did not make sense. Maybe the man was just vindictive by nature. He had gone to a different seminary than Fr. Wall had. Was he trying to get one of his pals a place to which he could move up? Maybe that was his game, or maybe he wanted to impress the Bishop, somehow.

Sleep came late and unwillingly to Fr. Wall that night and in the morning his temper was by no means improved. During the sleepless hours, however, he had evolved an idea. He would call Fr. Brockheim, the one who had been his attorney in that case against the janitor. Not the young fellow, Fr. Brown, for this was something which would call for a lot more experience than the young man had so far acquired. He did not really believe that there was much that could be done, but it would be some satisfaction to talk with a canonist about the situation. He remembered that there had been some men who went to Rome with their cases against their Bishops and won. Of course, even if you won you still lost, thought Fr. Wall, but maybe it would put a crimp in the style of that Chancellor, if he could work up something which might end up in Rome.

Fr. Brockheim agreed to come over to see Fr. Wall that evening, when Wall talked to him on the telephone. All day Wall was restless, wandering aimlessly around the house and over to the school and back. In the afternoon he tried to get out and play some golf, but there seemed to be more traps than usual on the course. Nothing went right and he stopped keeping score. Finally he even stopped playing, picked up his ball, and went back to the clubhouse and home.

The letter in his hands, Fr. Brockheim read it slowly and thoughtfully. Finally, he looked up at Fr. Wall and asked, "What's the lowdown on this business of *odium populi?*"

"Nothing to it, nothing at all. Just some busybodies with wag-

ging tongues trying to get rid of me. They never did like me and took the occasion of that suit I had with the janitor to turn still more of the people against me. Then when I fired him—I shouldn't have done it, I see now—they had just the thing they wanted to go to the Bishop and get me bounced out of here."

"Never mind the oratory. This is a serious case and you stand to lose your parish. Let's have the facts. If I'm going to find a way out of this for you I've got to know exactly where you stand in this matter. Save the forensics for some other time."

"Well! You're not very co-operative!" exclaimed Fr. Wall.

"I'm a canonist. I deal in facts and law. Emotions only cloud ideas. Do you want me to help you, or not?"

"Of course I want you to help me, if you can."

"Then let's have facts. Is your parish income really off?"

"We-ell, yes. Yes, of course. The income has dropped quite noticeably. I'll get the books and prove it to you."

"Never mind the books. Why is it off?"

"We-ell, people just aren't contributing as they did."

"Why not?"

"We-ell, they just don't have the money, I suppose."

"Or they're mad at you."

"Who would dare say that?"

"It has been said, right here in this letter. That's what you and I have to meet. Now, what's the truth of the matter?"

"We-ell, collections have fallen off, but not as much as they seem to think. Some of the people have been absent from Mass on Sundays, I have noticed. They have come as usual during the winter months, when they could not travel far; but when the weather has been nice the church has not been as full as usual. I got it from some of the children that their parents were taking them to one of the neighboring parishes. If they don't want to come here, that is their business. Still, I don't like the idea of that old pirate stealing my people."

"Is he stealing them, or do they just prefer to go for a drive on sunny Sunday mornings in summer? For that matter, are they the people who dislike what you have been doing with regard to Faber, that's his name isn't it?"

"We-ell, some of them, at least, are of the group which got mad about Faber, but I don't think all of them are like that. There

could not be that many people against me in the parish."

"Does their absence account for the falling off in revenue?"

"Not entirely, or, rather, I should say, the falling off is not actually as bad as it looks."

"What do you mean?"

"We-ell, there is a little fund which I have been setting aside for future purchases. You know, I figure we need a parking lot here, and so we have to set aside money until we have enough to buy it. No use having that appear as income, because the assessments might go up, and there would be that much less in the fund. Besides, I got caught once when they subpoenaed my books to see whether I could pay more to Faber, and I do not intend to be caught again with much net income showing."

"Do you mean to tell me that not all the income has gone down on the books?"

"It was just a little bit I set aside each Sunday."

"You're over a barrel on that, you know. How do you expect me to defend you on a point like that?"

Wall nodded soberly at those words and guessed that it had not been such a good idea after all.

"Now, what about this matter of your failing to administer the sacraments to that woman who was dying, and thus getting the parish down on you?" asked Fr. Brockheim.

"Oh, that! I had been to see her and had heard her confession and had taken her Viaticum a couple of times. I had anointed her, too. She was all prepared for death. Then I got a call to run in to the Chancery Office on some business, and when I got back the housekeeper told me that the people had been trying to get me while I was away, and that the woman was dead. I went right over, but the family was pretty upset that I had not been able to get there to say the prayers for the dying. There was nothing I could do about it. She was all prepared and I did have to get in to the Chancery Office when they called me. Then, of course, those busybodies took up the matter and tried to use it against me with the Bishop and, I guess, they've succeeded."

"When we show the true facts of the case I am quite sure that the Bishop will not hold it against you. It certainly does not look like a case of neglect of pastoral duties. I don't think we need to

worry about that charge too much. It won't be likely to stick when you tell your side of the story."

"Then you think we can beat this case against me?" queried Fr. Wall hopefully, sitting forward on his chair and gazing intently at Fr. Brockheim.

"I think we can knock out one of the arguments on which this *odium populi* is supposed to be based, that is all," responded the canonist shaking his head.

"Then I'm sunk. I can't imagine what I did to get that Chancellor down on me, either," said Fr. Wall letting his head sink between his hands and staring moodily at the floor.

"How do you know he's down on you? After all, this decision came from the Bishop and two of the Synodal Examiners. The Chancellor would be merely a notary on the case."

"How do you know it wasn't just the Bishop and the Chancellor?"

"It's obvious that the Bishop knows his Canon Law, and the letter even makes reference to canons in the section on administrative removals of pastors. Those canons call for a board to decide on whether you should be removed or not."

"But the Chancellor must have poisoned the mind of the Bishop against me."

"You're forgetting that there are two votes on the side of the Examiners and only one on the side of the Bishop. The notary does not vote in these cases, nor in any others. The most he could have done was notice and point out that there was something wrong with your financial reports, which I assume he handles, as most Chancellors do, but you were wide open on that score anyway."

"We-ell, why didn't he keep his big mouth shut?"

"He has a job to do, even as you and I, and it is only smart to expect that he would do it."

"Is he a friend of yours? You're certainly going out of your way to defend him."

"Law suits, Father, are won on facts and law, not on your emotional reactions to the people on the other side."

"What can we do, then? Do I just have to take this?"

Fr. Brockheim reread the letter from the Chancery Office and pointed out that Fr. Wall could do one of three things. First, he

could resign from the parish without further ado. Second, he could ask for a delay. This, Fr. Brockheim pointed out, would be for the purpose of preparing a defense to the charges made in the letter. Third, he could attack the reasons given in the letter for requesting his resignation.

If Fr. Wall complied with the request and resigned, the Bishop would declare the parish vacant on the basis of resignation.[1] The pastor could, however, give some reason for his resignation other than that contained in the letter requesting it. The provisio attached to this was that the reason offered by the pastor should be true and proper, for example, that he was resigning to comply with the wishes of the Bishop.[2] Thus, he could avoid any mention of the fact of *odium populi* or of the financial problems which were involved in the case. Such an allegation would avoid the difficulties for Fr. Wall which might arise from a mention of the reason, *odium populi,* given by the Bishop. People might suspect that the pastor had been changed because he could not get along with the people, but that would not be clear and in time the suspicion would die down.

It was even possible, Fr. Brockheim continued, for Fr. Wall to resign, not outright, but conditionally, provided the condition was such as could lawfully be accepted by the Bishop, and was in fact accepted by him.[3]

His resignation, like any other renunciation of office, to be valid, would have to be made in writing, or, if made orally, in the presence of two witnesses. It could also be made through a proxy acting under a special commission from the pastor. The written document of the resignation would have to be kept in the Chancery Office.[4]

On the other hand, if Fr. Wall wanted to fight the charge mentioned in the letter inviting him to resign, he could ask for a delay to collect the proofs which he would need in order to be successful in his fight. The Bishop could allow such a delay, provided that it would not result in damage to the spiritual welfare of the people.[5]

Was there any use, Fr. Brockheim wanted to know, in asking for a delay? What would Fr. Wall be able to prove to show that the *odium populi* was falsely charged? Could they scrape up any

[1] Cf. Can. 2150, § 1.
[2] Cf. Can. 2150, § 2.
[3] Cf. Can. 2150, § 3.
[4] Cf. Can. 186.
[5] Cf. Can. 2151.

evidence to show that it was really damaging to the parish to keep Fr. Wall there? If so, what would become of it when it was met with the contrary evidence that actually the income of the parish was falling off because of the feeling toward Fr. Wall?

After all, the parish was a corporation, being a benefice,[6] i.e. a legal entity set up or "erected by a competent ecclesiastical authority to have perpetual existence, and consisting of a sacred office and the right to receive from the endowment the income connected with the office.[7] To the parish, therefore, as a legal entity, belonged the contributions of the faithful which constituted its "endowment." [8] The position of the pastor was that of administrator. He was not an owner, any more than directors of a civil corporation were owners of the property and income of the corporation. It was the legal entity which was the owner, and he was simply in the position of a corporate officer, bound to administer the property and income for the best interests of the corporation.

The pastor, therefore, was bound to be prudent in the fulfillment of his duties. He was to see to it that the ecclesiastical property entrusted to his care was in no wise lost or damaged.[9] He was also to observe carefully and faithfully the rules laid down by law, whether canon or civil, and those which were imposed by the one who had endowed the benefice or made some particular donation thereto, or which were imposed by lawful authority.[10] He was to collect the income and profits of the property carefully and at the proper time. These he was to keep in a safe place and to use according to the intention of the founder of the benefice or established laws and rules.[11] Moneys belonging to the church, which remained after expenses were paid and which could with profit be invested, he was to invest for the advantage of the church itself, with the consent of the Bishop.[12]

Books showing income and expenses he was to keep, and keep in good order.[13] Here, Fr. Brockheim observed, was a point which they would certainly have difficulty in meeting. The proofs would be too strong against them. If they let the books stand as they were it would be hard to overcome the contention that the reaction

[6] Cf. Can. 99.
[7] Cf. Can. 1409.
[8] Cf. Can. 1410.
[9] Cf. Can. 1523, 1°.
[10] Cf. Can. 1523, 2°.
[11] Cf. Can. 1523, 3°.
[12] Cf. Can. 1523, 4°.
[13] Cf. Can. 1523, 5°.

against the pastor had definitely been to the damage of the parish corporation which was losing revenue by reason of his continued presence, and on the other hand, if they attempted to argue that the loss of revenue was not so great as it seemed, and that consequently the *odium populi* was not so damaging as it seemed, it would be necessary to admit that the books had not been kept as required by law.

As for the rule[14] requiring that the documents and legal papers on which the rights of the church to its property rested were to be kept in proper order and preserved in the archives of the church or in a convenient and suitable safe, while their authentic copies, where convenient, were kept in the archives or safe of the Curia, no problem was raised on that, nor was any defense there material to the issue raised by the request for resignation.

The fact of the matter was, Fr. Brockheim concluded, that there seemed to be little or no ground on which to attack the reasons given for requesting Fr. Wall's resignation.

Fr. Wall demanded to know how it had happened that other pastors had been able to resist such a request for their resignation and had even been able to take their cases to Rome and win out. Of course, he realized, he added, that it was probably not smart to do such a thing because a man still had to live in the diocese even after he had won his case.

Fr. Brockheim did not think that the last observation was valid, for it was but natural that after a case had been taken to Rome and the Congregation there had had to intervene administratively to reverse a decision of a Bishop the Congregation would continue to keep the case in mind and be interested in whether the further treatment of the pastor in question was in accord with the rules of justice and equity which it had laid down.

The only remedy in law against a final decree in cases of this sort was recourse to the Apostolic See.[15] If such a recourse was made, all the acts or records of the proceedings had to be forwarded to the Holy See.[16] It was wise to assume, Fr. Brockheim pointed out, that the Bishop was aware of this provision of the canons and was taking all the steps in the proper sequence and

[14] Cf. Can. 1523, 6°.

[15] Cf. Can. 2146, § 1.

[16] Cf. Can. 2146, §2.

with sufficient evidence to bolster his conclusions, not jumping at them.

Fr. Wall certainly did not seem to have any evidence which he could offer to offset the effect of the evidence which had moved the Bishop to request his resignation. Thus, when the whole case reached the Holy See the evidence would clearly support the position taken by the Bishop, and the Congregation would have no other course to take save to affirm the decision given by the local board.

It was only in cases in which the proper procedure had not been followed, or in which the evidence was clearly insufficient to sustain the decision below, that the higher administrative reviewing body could feel justified in reversing the decision made below. After all, the Congregation was pretty far removed from the scene of the trouble and was practically constrained to rely on the discretion of the men who were present where things had occurred.

The canons had not left the decision to the discretion of one man. They had required the presence and vote of two Examiners together with the Bishop, and a Notary to record all that took place, so that if the case were taken higher the Congregation could get as accurate a picture as possible of what had taken place in the diocese.

The decision, therefore, was the result of a considered vote of three men. So long as they had followed the legal procedure required for such cases and had handed down a decision which reasonably fitted the facts adduced in evidence and recorded by the notary, it would be very hard to get a reversal of their decision.

Should Fr. Wall decide to attack the reasons given for asking him to resign he would have to give reasons for his side. These reasons the Bishop would have to consider together with the two Examiners who had been in on the previous decision to ask him to resign. After hearing what those two men had to say, the Bishop would either approve the reasons given by Fr. Wall for his side, or would reject them.[17] The final decision of the Bishop, whether affirmative or negative, would be made known to Fr. Wall in the form of a decree.[18]

Should that decree be unfavorable to him, the pastor, since he was classified as "irremovable," could have recourse against it, and

[17] Cf. Can. 2152, § 1.

[18] Cf. Can. 2152, §2.

obtain another hearing from the same Bishop. The recourse would have to be made within ten days from the handing down of the first decree. Then the Bishop would have to call in two Pastors Consultors, not Diocesan Consultors, but two of the Pastors Consultors appointed in the Synod, or extra-synodally. The three would then consider the new allegations made by the pastor and presented within ten days of the time he had made the recourse. They would consider these new allegations in conjuction with the reasons he had first given and would decide whether to allow or to reject them.[19]

If it should have happened that the pastor had discovered other witnesses in the meantime whom he had been unable to call for the first line of defense he offered, and if he could prove that he had been unable to get them for the first hearing, he would be allowed to bring them in to substantiate his position at this second hearing.[20] Once again the decision of the three men would be made known to the pastor by a decree.[21]

It was after this final decree, this final termination of the administrative procedure in the diocesan hearings that the pastor would be entitled to make the recourse to the Holy See, mentioned in Canon 2146.

Fr. Wall agreed that unless something had gone very wrong on the face of the proceedings it would be difficult to get the Holy See to reverse the concurrent decisions of two diocesan boards. It was true that the Bishop was in on both hearings and both decisions. It was true that his presence might have some tendency to weight the decisions. It was, however, also true that it would be difficult to convince anyone that four different men, who had sworn to perform faithfully their duties, had so completely disregarded the truth of the matter as to hand down a decision which was patently unjust. It would take strong evidence of prejudice and lack of regard for the facts to overturn two concurrent decisions.

Fr. Brockheim pointed out, too, that when the decision had finally been made to remove the pastor, the Bishop was to call in the Examiners or the Pastors Consultors who had taken part

[19] Cf. Can. 2153, § 1.

[20] Cf. Can. 2153, § 2.

[21] Cf. Can. 2153, § 3.

in decreeing the removal and with their advice try, as far as he was able, to provide for the Pastor who had been removed. This might be done by transferring him to another parish, or by assigning some other office or benefice to him, if the pastor was fitted for it, or by granting him a pension, as the case might require and the circumstances permit.[22] All things being equal more favor was to be shown to one who had resigned than to one who had been removed, according to the Canon.[23]

While a pastor's recourse to the Holy See was still pending, of course, the Bishop could not validly confer the parish or benefice from which the pastor had been removed on another in a permanent fashion.[24] Fr. Brockheim, therefore, questioned whether it was wise to institute such a recourse when there was no apparent possibility of winning out. The recourse would delay provision for the parish until it had been decided. If there was but little hope of the decision being reversed there was not much point in leaving things in suspense.

Fr. Wall wanted to know how long he would have to wait for another appointment were he to resign, or were he removed, since it did not look as if he could effectively argue against the facts on which the request for his resignation was based. Fr. Brockheim then pointed out that the matter of a new provision for the pastor who had been removed could be taken care of, either in the decree of removal or later, though it was to be done *"quamprimum"* if it was not included in the decree itself.[25]

The priest who had been removed from his parish would have to leave the parish house free *"quamprimum"* and hand over everything belonging to the parish to the new pastor or administrator appointed for the interim by the Bishop.[26] Of course, if the pastor was ill and could not be moved without inconvenience from the parish house to some other place the Bishop was to leave to the sick man the use of the house, (even its exclusive use, while his need continued.[27]

The conclusion, then, seemed to be that he had made some serious mistakes, Fr. Wall agreed. These mistakes were such that the Bishop could, in law, remove him according to the administrative

[22] Cf. Can. 2154, § 1.
[23] Cf. Can. 2154, § 2.
[24] Cf. Can. 2146, § 3.
[25] Cf. Can. 2155.
[26] Cf. Can. 2156, § 1.
[27] Cf. Can. 2156, § 2.

procedure for such cases. While he could, in theory, oppose the removal there was but little chance of getting enough facts together to make his opposition stick. Thus, it was not very likely that he could convince the Bishop and the two Examiners that the invitation to resign should be withdrawn. Their decision that it should stand would be a decree, and he would be less well off than if he had resigned as requested.

Furthermore, if he could not make his position stick with the Bishop and the two Examiners, there was not much likelihood that he could make it stick on another hearing with the Bishop and the two Pastors Consultors. If he could not make it stick in either of those two hearings, it was hardly likely that he could make it stick in Rome.

Turning to his desk Fr. Wall took up his pen to write that he was hereby submitting his resignation, to comply with the wishes of the Bishop.

(The End)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

GOOD OUT OF EVIL

For the Catholic Church has been vindicated by heretics, and those that think rightly by those that think wrongly. For many things lay hid in the Scriptures and when the heretics had been cut off, they troubled the Church of God with questions; those things were then opened up which lay hid, and the will of God was understood. . . .For was the Trinity perfectly treated before the Arians carped at it? Was penance perfectly treated before the Novatians raised their voice against it? So too Baptism was not perfectly treated of before the rebaptizers who were cast out of the fold contradicted it. Nor were the doctrines of the very oneness of Christ clearly set forth until those who had separated began to press upon the weak; then, lest the weak be troubled by the questionings of the ungodly, those that knew by their words and disputations brought out into open day the obscure things of the Law.

—St. Augustine in *Ennarrationes in psalmos,* LIV,22.

JESUS CHRIST'S REVELATION OF HIS MESSIANIC DIGNITY AND OF HIS DIVINITY

In this article we propose to discuss first our Lord's reserve during the early stages of His public ministry in making known His identity. Then we shall show that He did definitely and clearly make the claim that He is the promised Messias, and that He was so understood by the people and the religious leaders of His time. Thirdly we shall consider His revelation of Himself as the Son of God, and the reaction of the people to this claim.

REASONS FOR RESERVE

In considering our Lord's revelation of His identity and mission we must take into account the prevailing notions of the time among the Jews. Only thus can we understand the reserve with which our Lord speaks of Himself as the Christ and as the Son of God. There was political dynamite in the word "Christ" or "Messias" in Palestine at the time of our Lord. The term immediately conjured up in the minds of the people dreams of a political emancipator who would overthrow by physical force the domination of the hated foreign oppressor, Rome. The claim, therefore, to be the Messias, if it was prematurely or injudiciously made, would have stirred up the spirit of mob violence, and for that reason would have cast suspicion on him who made it and have led to his arrest and execution as a political rebel. There are instances in the history of the period of men who made this claim, put themselves at the head of a revolt, were apprehended and executed.[1]

There was another reason for reserve and caution in laying claim to the title of Messias. Jesus of Nazareth did not measure up to the preconceived and false notions which prevailed relative to the character and work of the Messias; His doctrine both as to moral principles and the nature of the Messianic kingdom did not coincide with what the Jews had been misled to expect of the Messias and of the Kingdom He was to inaugurate. These erroneous notions of the people, including the most intimate followers

[1] Cf. Holzmeister: *Historia aetatis Novi Testamenti,* p. 156 and passim; Lagrange: *Le Judaisme avant Jésus-Christ,* pp. 205 f.

of our Lord, had to be dealt with gently and gradually corrected. Jesus must, therefore, first win their confidence in Himself as a wise teacher sent from God and lead them to love Him as their friend and benefactor. This He would do by the unusual wisdom of His utterances, the charm of His eloquence, the holiness of His life, His gentleness, His extraordinary kindness and sympathy for the oppressed and the outcast; His love for the poor, His indulgence to repentent sinners. But His greatest appeal to their trust and admiration was His works of power, His miracles which were striking evidence of a superhuman power in Jesus and of God's approval of Him. After thus winning the trust and love of the people, after thus convincing them that he really was a "teacher sent from God," they would be in the proper frame of mind to listen to Him and to change their false ideas about the Messias and His Kingdom, as was St. Peter when he said, "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have come to believe and to know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (*John* 6:69-70).

There were similar reasons why Jesus could not at the very outset have openly and directly made the claim that He was the Son of God. The basic dogma of the Jews was the absolute unicity and spirituality of God. If Jesus of Nazareth, obviously a being of flesh and blood, son of a village carpenter, as was thought, had at the outset of His public life made the claim that He was a divine Person, the Jews would immediately have seized Him as a blasphemer and have stoned Him to death. And in that event our Lord would have had no opportunity to deliver His message, to establish His Kingdom, and to train legates who would perpetuate His work after Him in the world. Thus in the case of revealing His divinity our Lord adapted Himself to the prejudices of the people, and only after He had done all that was possible to enlighten those who heard and saw Him would He make the most astounding claim that He was no mere man, but God as well. The claim would be much less astounding, much easier to accept, coming from one who had established Himself in the minds of the people as a most holy, a most wise, a most gentle, kind, and sympathetic Being, who was at the same time endowed with the most extraordinary power of miracles.

CLAIM TO MESSIANIC DIGNITY

Our Lord did not blatantly proclaim Himself Messias from the outset of His public life in that spirit of self-advertising that was so characteristic of the many charlatans, miracle men, and false prophets of His time. He rather sought, for reasons of prudence and humility, to withhold those who had come to the realization that He was the Messias from publishing the glad news (*Mark* 1:25-28; 1:44; *Matt.* 9:30; 16:20; 17:9; *John* 6:15). Far from loudly proclaiming from the time of His first public appearance that He was the Messias and the Son of God, He rather chose the humble title "Son of Man." In this He was in striking contrast with the princes of His time who apotheosized themselves and exacted divine honors from their subjects.

What is the meaning of this title "Son of Man"? The whole exegetic tradition from the Fathers to Maldonatus is opposed to the specifically messianic and eschatological sense of this expression.[2] If such were the case our Lord would have from the outset of His public life have proclaimed Himself the Messias, but that would have been in opposition to His entire conduct. Yet the term was susceptible of a messianic connotation because of Daniel 7:13, which an exegetical tradition has always identified with the Messias,[3] and when the opportune time arrived our Lord linked His use of the term with that messianic passage.

Lagrange thinks that the title as used by our Lord of Himself means "the man that I am," and that He used it to draw attention to His person without taking openly and officially the title of Messias.[4] Of course the title does not exclude the most glorious messianic prerogatives. Jesus, as the Son of Man, claims for Himself the power to forgive sins and to dispense with the Sabbath observance. The Pharisees would not have conceded such power to the Messias, but Jesus can do these things because He is what He is. The name also emphasizes the human nature of our Lord, a nature capable of suffering, and, therefore, this title is proper whenever He alluded to His Passion (*Mark* 8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33); whenever He spoke of His purpose in sacrificing His

[2] Cf. Lagrange: *L'Evangile selon S. Marc,* p. CXXXVI.

[3] Cf. Bonsirven: *Les enseignements de Jésus-Christ,* p. 60.

[4] Cf. Lagrange: *L'Evangile selon S. Marc, loc. cit.*

life (*Mark* 10:45), or of the humiliation entailed in His Passion or of His glorification in His resurrection (*Mark* 9:9).

In taking this title our Lord did not abdicate His role as Messias, nor did He deny that He was more than a mere man. Rather He would drive home to His auditors and to all succeeding generations that He was a very real human being, a member of the human race in full sympathy with all mankind. But it was not a designation of His humanity that excluded His divinity.

At the proper time Jesus would connect the title with the vision of Daniel (7:13-14). That would be at the solemn moment when His answer to the high priest would determine whether or not the death sentence was to be pronounced against him. Then our Lord alluded to His coming in glory and used language taken from the prophecy of Daniel.

THE GOSPEL EVIDENCE THAT JESUS WAS THE MESSIAS

The annunciation to Mary by the angel Gabriel is couched in terms that no Jew versed in the Scriptures would fail to recognize as messianic, reminiscent as the passage is of Old Testament prophecies. There is unmistakable allusion to Isaias 7:14; Psalm 2:7; II Kings 7:8-17; Psalm 88; Psalm 131; Daniel 7:13-14. The angel, announcing the birth of Jesus to the shepherds, expressly declares that He is the Messias (*Luke* 2:10). The angel, enlightening St. Joseph concerning Mary's pregnancy, quotes the messianic prophecy of Isaias 7:14, and calls the infant "Saviour," a current designation of the Messias. The prophecy of Simeon no less clearly points to the fact that Jesus is the Messias. Simeon had been enlightened by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before his eyes would gaze into the face of the Messias, and in his canticle he alludes to several Old Testament prophecies which are messianic in import (*Luke* 2:25-35; *Isaias* 19:24-25; 42:6; 49:6; 60:3). John the Baptist repeatedly pointed to our Lord as the Messias. He does not use the express term, but he does use equivalent terminology whose import no Jew could misunderstand (*John* 1:23, 29, 41-49; 3:28).

Our Lord, for reasons which we have stated above, was not willing expressly to claim the messianic dignity for himself from the beginning of His public life. But when the proper time arrived, He elicited from the apostles a confession of His messianic char-

acter (*John* 6:70; *Matt.* 16:17), but at the same time He strictly charged the apostles that they were to keep the knowledge to themselves for the present.[5]

As the time for our Lord's apprehension and condemnation drew near, He permitted the public acknowledgment of His messianic dignity. We see this in the case of the blind beggar at Jericho, who, without being rebuked by our Lord, called Him the Son of David, and in the triumphal entry of our Lord into Jerusalem, when He permitted the populace to give Him a great ovation as the Son of David. When the Jewish leaders, fearing a popular uprising in favor of Jesus as Messias, sought to have our Lord restrain them, he replied that if "these keep silence, the stones will cry out" (*Luke* 19:40).

A day or two later Jesus declared that the title "Son of David," which is certainly a messianic title, was too restricted. He accepted it but only with the understanding that He who rightfully bears it is greater than David, is in fact David's Lord (*Mark* 12:35 ff. and parables).

The classical declaration of our Lord that He is the Christ is that which He made at what was the most critical moment of His life, when He stood before the tribunal of the high priest on trial for His life. The judge put Him under oath to answer the question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One," to which our Lord answered, "I am." (*Mark* 14:61). St. Luke makes it quite clear that two questions were asked, thus indicating that to the Jewish mind there was a distinction between being the Christ and being the Son of God. It is quite certain that the Jews understood our Lord in the sense that He really claimed to be the Messias, for they mockingly refer to Him as such over and over again.

There can be no doubt that our Lord claimed to be the Messias. The manner in which the Gospels depict His gradual revelation of His identity as Messias is in perfect harmony with what we know of the mentality of the people to whom He presented Himself. He took into consideration their prejudices and erroneous notions, and

[5] Cf. our Lord commanding silence in the case of the devils and of the beneficiaries of His miracles; also His stealing away from the crowd that sought to make Him King after the miracle of the loaves *John* 6:11 ff.; *Mark* 1:24-25; 1:34; 3:1-12; *Luke* 4:35; 5:43; *Matt.* 8:4; 9:30; 12:16; etc.

handled them with the utmost consideration, first trying to instil the correct concept of the Messias and of His Kingdom. Then, only when He had done all that He could to prepare their minds, He made the clear-cut claim that He is the Messias. Is there not a lesson for us who deal with those whose minds are victims of misinformation and erroneous ideas in the method used by our Lord?

CLAIMS TO DIVINITY

We shall consider the proofs of our Lord's divinity under the following heads: (1) what He said of His divine nature: (a) implicit claims; (b) explicit claims; (2) the testimony of Heaven; (3) the testimony of the apostles.

WHAT OUR LORD SAID

(a) *Implicit Claims.* In the Sermon on the Mount (*Matt.* 5-7) our Lord said over and over again, "It was said to you of old, [i.e. in the Law which was of divine origin] . . . but I say to you." It is clear that Jesus on His own authority interprets and adds to the Law. Since the Law was given by God, Jesus in adding to it and in claiming to speak with equal authority, implicitly claims to be God. This claim is also implied in His declaration, "I came not to destroy the Law but to fulfill it." Although He did not destroy the Law, the statement carries the implication that He could have done so; that He had the authority to do so. In view of the tone of absolute and final authority with which He spoke, it is not surprising that the people were in admiration of Him as one speaking with authority and not like the Scribes and Pharisees who carried on interminable disputes and pitted the authority of one great rabbi against another without ever arriving at a clear-cut conclusion.[6]

Jesus as the Son of Man claims with complete calm and serenity the power to forgive sins. Since this is an exclusively divine prerogative, the claim to exercise it in His own name is equivalent to a claim to be divine (*Mark* 2:1 ff. and parallels).

Jesus declares that He is the Lord of the Sabbath (*Mark* 2:28 and parallels). The Sabbath Law was divinely given; it has the

[6] St. Irenaeus remarks that the prophets said: "Haec dicit Dominus," but Jesus: "Ego dico." *Cont. Haer.* IV. xxxvi. *MPG,* VII, 1090.

authority of God back of it. Only God, therefore, can declare that He is the Master of the Sabbath.

Jesus claims that His words are absolute and immutable truth, more enduring than the heavens above and the earth on which we live. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (*Mark* 13:31 and parallels). "What mere man in his right mind," asks Bonsirven, "would have the effrontery to issue such a challenge?"[7] And since His utterances are absolute truth, He demands faith just like that which we put in God the Father. "You believe in God, believe also in me" (*John* 14:1).

The miracles which our Lord performed in such profusion also point to the conclusion that He is the author of nature and its laws. It is true that great saints have performed miracles, but they did not perform them in the way our Lord did. He assumes absolute control on His own authority over the winds and the waves, over physical ailments which are beyond the power of medical science to cure. The manner in which our Lord speaks when performing these miracles should be carefully noted. Consider for example: "Lord, *if thou wilt,* thou canst make me clean. . . . *I will;* be thou made clean" (*Matt.* 8:2). To the blind men of Jericho Jesus said: "What wouldst thou have *me* to do?" This implies that Jesus had Himself the power to grant the man's request for the restoration of his sight (*Matt.* 20:29 ff.). To the daughter of Jairus who was dead, Jesus said: "Girl, I say to thee, arise" (*Mark* 5:38 ff.; *Luke* 8:15 ff.). To the raging waves and whistling winds during the storm on Lake Genesareth, Jesus simply said: "Peace, be still" (*Mark* 4:39). We can safely answer the wondering question of the disciples, "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" by saying that He is the Creator and, therefore, the Master of nature.

The fourth Gospel is replete with implicit claims to divinity made by our Lord. Jesus claimed unity of knowledge with the Father (*John* 16:30 *et al.*), and unity of action with the Father, with the same continuity, the same effectiveness, and the same power (*John* 5:17 ff; 10:28-30). All this entails divine knowledge and divine activity, which in turn postulate the divine nature.

(b) *Explicit Claims.* The first explicit claim is the well-known statement of our Lord as recorded in the Synoptics (*Matt.* 11:

[7] *Op. cit.,* p. 392.

25-27 and *Luke* 10:21-22):[8] "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father except the Son. . . ." "This passage contains the whole of the Christology of the fourth Gospel."[9] Jesus claims to have perfect and comprehensive knowledge of God the Father. It is unique; it is coextensive with that of the Father. Such knowledge as our Lord here ascribes to Himself can be had only by one who is of a nature equal to God. For perfect knowledge of God who is infinite requires an infinite cognitive virtue. And only He who is divine has such power of knowing.

The most startling explicit claim of our Lord to divinity is found in the emphatic words, "I and the Father are one." The context of this statement (*John* 10:25-30) should be carefully noted. The Jews believe not, because they are not of Jesus' sheep. These know Him and He knows them, and He imparts to them eternal life, i.e. grace which is the seed of eternal life. Verse 29 should read: "What the Father has given to me is greater than all," i.e. the sheep which the Father has entrusted to the keeping of Jesus are His great concern, the only reason why He came to earth. Note the parallel: no one snatches them from my hand—no one snatches them from the hand of my Father. The hand, i.e. the power of the Son, is therefore the same as the power of the Father. The reasoning can briefly be summed up as follows: no one snatches them from my hand, because no one snatches them from the hand of my Father, for the Father and I are one. It should be noted that the neuter gender is used for *one,* i.e. We, the Father and I, although we are two distinct Persons, are one nature.

Some interpreters, it is true, among the moderns, understand this declaration of a moral unity, a unity of will and sentiment.[10] But such an interpretation goes counter to the immediate context, and the whole tenor of the fourth gospel's Christology cries aloud

[8] The authenticity of this passage has been questioned. It is well defended by Lagrange: *L'Evangile selon S. Luc,* pp. 304 f. The authenticity is accepted by the rationalistic Cadoux in the *The Historic Mission of Jesus,* p. 36.

[9] Plumer: *The Gospel according to St. Luke,* p. 282.

[10] Bernard, *The Gospel according to St. John,* and *Expositor's Greek Testament in loc.* accept the statement in the sense of moral union.

in protest against it. St. John Chrysostom[11] understands it of unity of power, but he concludes that unity of power postulates unity of nature. Since power was the idea of the preceeding statement, in the following statement the idea is the basis of that unity of power explicitly stated, unity of nature.

The immediate context of this passage, however, contains a difficulty against the literal interpretation according to which Jesus claims unity of nature with God the Father. When the Jews took up stones threatening to stone Him to death for blasphemy, He stopped them by the appeal to their Sacred Scriptures. He reminded them that in Psalm 82:6, God calls human judges gods (*elohim*). Here as elsewhere (*Ex.* 21:6; 22:8; *Dt.* 19:17) where representatives of God on earth are called *elohim,* the meaning is that God has shared with men a part of His divine authority. The sense, therefore, in which the word *elohim* is used, is very much attenuated. Our Lord, it is argued, similarly attenuates the sense in which He calls Himself Son of God, and therefore, we cannot conclude that when He said, "The Father and I are One," that He meant to be understood in any but a metaphorical or attenuated sense. There is a sort of moral unanimity, just as the delegate constitutes one moral person with him whom he represents.

This objection is sound if we argue that Jesus concluded from the metaphorical sense of the psalm He cites to the metaphorical sense of His claim to be the Son of God. But Jesus does not draw any conclusion at all. His argument rather amounts to this: "You cannot accuse me of blasphemy since the Sacred Scriptures grant the title *god* to certain human beings. In what sense they were gods is to be determined from other considerations, not from the use of the term itself." The citation of the psalm simply establishes on scriptural grounds that some men may be properly called gods. Whether it be in the metaphorical or strictly literal sense is to be determined and proven from other arguments and considerations.

That the Jews relinquished their plan to stone our Lord is no proof that Jesus had withdrawn His claim or explained it away as being merely a metaphor, a usage which would have been quite acceptable to the Pharisees. The ultimate reason why they gave up the idea of stoning Jesus was that "His hour had not yet come."

[11] Cf. *Hom. LXI in Joan. MPG,* LIX, 338.

The immediate reason was that an appeal to the Scriptures for which they had such profound regard had sobered them and somewhat calmed their angry indignation. It led them to reflect and investigate further before taking decisive action. They would arrest our Lord and hail Him before their highest religious tribunal, and await its decision. What that decision was, we shall see.

Our Lord then goes on to appeal to His works as the argument which is to determine the sense in which He is the Son of God. "If I do not perform the works of my Father, do not believe me. But if I do perform them, and if you are not willing to believe, believe the works, that you may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in the Father."

The Jews sought to arrest Him, and ultimately they did do so, that Jesus might be tried before their religious tribunal. That the Jews' first impression was right, that Jesus really did claim to be the Son of God in the strict sense, is made clear by the result of the trial. "What further need have we of witnesses? You have heard the blasphemy" (*Mark* 14:63-64). "We have a Law, and according to that Law he must die, because He made himself Son of God" (*John* 19:7).

Another objection is based on the saying of our Lord recorded in the fourth Gospel, "The Father is greater than I" (*John* 14:28). The most satisfactory explanation of these words, the one which alone seems to be in accord with the context, where our Lord is seeking to console the disciples in their grief at His leaving them, is that which is based on the following considerations. Becoming man, Jesus placed Himself, without relinquishing in the least degree any of His divine prerogatives, in a condition of inferiority to the condition of the Father who remained in heavenly glory and continued to "dwell in light inaccessible." This condition of inferiority, be it noted carefully, affects only the external situation of Father and Son. As incarnate, the Son is exposed to insults, to crucifixion and to death in His human nature, and by reason of the incarnation and the consequent possibility of suffering outrages and the most excruciating torments, He is in a state of being inferior to that of the Father. But when He goes to the Father, Jesus will no longer be exposed to these outrages. His humanity will be endowed with all the properties of the glorified body. He

will no longer be in a condition in which He can say "the Father is greater than I." Jesus will not cease to be the God-Man, but after His glorification He will be incapable of suffering, and thus His going to the Father is a great motive of consolation for the disciples. This explanation fits the context perfectly, and is in general the explanation of St. John Chrysostom,[12] and among the moderns of Knabenbauer[13] and Lagrange.[14]

We have already alluded to the most decisive claim of our Lord to divinity, made before the high priest when Jesus was on trial for His life . It is to be noted carefully that the terms "Christ" and "Son of God" were not synonymous to the Jews of our Lord's day. Therefore, the high priest put two questions to our Lord, as is more clearly indicated in the gospel according to St. Luke (*22*:66-70). The high priest seems deliberately to have so formulated his question that our Lord could only answer in the affirmative, unless He wished to deny His whole life, its import and the explicit claims He had made. And if He did answer affirmatively, then they could accuse Him of blasphemy. It was not blasphemy to claim to be the Messias or the Son of God in a metaphorical sense. The sense, then, in which the high priest and the members of the Sanhedrin took the words was metaphysical. According to the fourth gospel the ultimate reason why Jesus was condemned to die, was that "He made himself the Son of God" (*John* 19:*7*).

THE TESTIMONY OF HEAVEN

The testimony of our Lord in favor of His own identity is capital in the argument establishing His divinity. The testimony of heaven would mean little unless it were acknowledged by our Lord, and the belief of the apostles can be reasonably explained only on the grounds that our Lord had acknowledged that He really was the Son of God.

We can, therefore, be very brief in setting down the testimony of heaven. The testimony of God the Father to the divinity of Jesus is contained in two passages, that which describes the theophany at His baptism, and that which describes the transfiguration. It seems more probable that the voice from heaven was meant ex-

[12] Cf. *Hom. LXXV in Joan. MPG,* LIX, 403.

[13] Cf. *Com. in Ev. sec. Joan., in loc.*

[14] Cf. *L'Evangile selon S. Jean, in loc.*

clusively at the time for John the Baptist. It was fitting that he should have an official declaration from heaven as to the identity of Jesus, not merely as the Messias but as the Son of God.

Later on, after the apostles had slowly arrived at the conviction that Jesus was the Son of God in the literal sense and Peter had voiced his own and their conviction at Caesarea Philippi, it was fitting that this conviction and confession should be confirmed from heaven as it was in the transguration.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES

In view of what our Lord was, did, and had to say about His identity, we can expect nothing else than that the apostles would reach a profound and unshakable conviction that He is the Christ, the Son of the living God. So they did. Peter was their spokesman at Caesarea Philippi, and subsequently their writings are one unanimous testimony to that faith which the genuinely Christian world has from then on held without wavering. Let Peter again be our spokesman: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of everlasting life, and we have come to believe and to know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (*John* 6:69-70); "There is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (*Acts* 4:12).

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

TRANQUILLITY OF MIND

If some are so strangely vain and inhuman that they take pride in being absolutely callous to everything and in remaining unmoved and uninfluenced by any affection, they do not find a true tranquillity of mind but rather lose their whole humanity. For because a thing is hard it is not therefore right nor is a thing wholesome because it is unfeeling.

—St. Augustine in *De civitate Dei,* ix, 6.

Answers to Questions

BRIDE AND GROOM AT NUPTIAL MASS

Question: Where is the proper place for the married couple to kneel during the Nuptial Mass? I am presuming that they are placed in the sanctuary, as seems to be the general custom, but should they kneel together on a double prie-dieu in the centre or on two prie-dieux, one on either side, and when it comes to the moment of blessing or of Holy Communion should they remain where they are or come to kneel on the edge of the predella?

Answer: The Ritual (VII, ii, 1) simply says that the bride and groom should kneel *ante altare* for the wedding ceremony. The Missal (*Missa votiva pro sponso et sponsa*) directs that for the nuptial blessing the two subjects are again to be kneeling *ante altare.* Just where *ante altare* is depends on local custom. Martinucci (IV, 12) directs that the husband and wife kneel at the altar railing during the Mass but the more general custom is to have them remain in the sanctuary. We think it more convenient to have them occupy a double prie-dieu in the centre of the sanctuary rather than have them separated, one kneeling on the Epistle side and the other on the Gospel side. Our own practice is to have them remain at the prie-dieu for both portions of the nuptial blessing as well as for the reception of Holy Communion. In many places, however, they leave the place where they are kneeling and come to kneel on the edge of the predella for these blessings and for Holy Communion. This is awkward, it seems to us, as there is often no one to tell them just when they should come up for the blessing and the repeated arrangement of the bride's train is another source of difficulty. However, since nothing definite is prescribed by the rubrics or liturgical legislation, the custom of the place may be followed as to just where the prie-dieux are to be stationed and whether or not the *sponsi* are to remain at them either for the blessing or for Holy Communion.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE GENUFLECTION

Question: I have heard that our genuflection is of rather modern introduction. I know that in the Eastern rites they make a low

bow where we would make a genuflection. It seems strange that so distinctively Catholic a gesture is not older in the liturgy.

Answer: The genuflection, especially the single genuflection when only the right knee touches the floor, is a peculiarity of the Western Church and its origin is no more ancient than the late Middle Ages. The primitive Sacramentaries and the early Roman Missals make no mention of it. The article on the subject in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* quoting Fr. Thurston, gives the date A.D. 1502 as that of the formal and semi-official recognition of such genuflections. The Carthusians still have no genuflections at Mass, except a single one after the consecration of the Chalice, a profound bow being made after each elevation. The Dominicans considerably limit the number of their genuflections at Mass. Genuflections had no place in the original Carmelite Rite. Even after it became usual to raise the Sacred Host and the Chalice immediately after the consecration, it was long before the genuflections before and after each elevation became customary and longer still before they became of obligation.

Kneeling down, however, and remaining down longer than the momentary bending of the knees, is of ancient origin. While the original attitude for prayer was standing, it was quite early that kneeling for prayer was introduced for penitential seasons and ferial days. In the Eastern Churches, to-day and even since the days of the original liturgy of which they are the evolution, while genuflections of our sort are unknown, there are times when the clergy and people kneel for prayer during Mass.

ACADEMIC DRESS FOR MONSIGNORI

Question: When a Monsignor (domestic prelate) is present at an academic function, for instance when he is to receive an LL.D. at a college commencement, should he wear the doctor's cap and robe or be dressed simply in his "house" cassock, black with red trimmings, and the purple sash and purple ferraiolo?

Answer: The ceremonial dress of a domestic prelate on any occasion other than a liturgical function (at which he should wear the choir costume), is the black cassock, trimmed as indicated in the question, with the purple sash and purple ferraiolo. Hence, we should say that this would not be incorrect to wear also on

academic occasions. This happens to be the custom at The Catholic University of America when prelatical members of the teaching staff or of the administration attend academic functions outside the church.

There is, however, a special academic dress for prelates, which we have never seen in this country. This costume is described by Nainfa (*Costume of Prelates,* VIII, 5) as consisting of: the purple choir cassock, the purple sash with the tassels, the purple mantelletta, and the *prete* hat with the reddish cord. In strict etiquette, purple silk gloves should also be worn. The prelate's biretta may be substituted for the hat. He should wear the ring if he has the doctor's degree.

Our own preference, however, especially for an occasion on which the prelate is to receive a degree, would be for him to wear the academic robe and the cap, biretta or mortar-board, depending on the degree to be conferred. Under the doctor's robe, we think that he should wear the black cassock, with the trimmings of amaranth red, and the simpler purple sash.

THE CIBORIUM VEIL

Question: Is it proper to use for a ciborium veil one of fine lace over a foundation of old gold silk?

Answer: *Serventur rubricae.* The Ritual (IV, 1, 5) prescribes for the ciborium a veil of white silk. Authors generally extend this to include more precious materials such as cloth of gold or cloth of silver. Silk of the color called "old gold" is not a legitimate equivalent of cloth of gold.

THE BAPTISMAL SALT NOT TO BE TAKEN HOME

Question: Is it permitted to give to the sponsors or others interested some of the baptismal salt to be taken home by them for devotional use?

Answer: An actual instance of the practice about which enquiry is here made has never occurred in our experience. However, there is no doubt concerning the illicit character of such a practice. The Ritual itself (II, i, 55) most expressly forbids giving this salt to any but the subjects of Baptism on the occa-

sion of the administration of the sacrament. It may be added here that the Ritual also provides that the salt to be used in Baptism is to be specially blessed for that purpose and that the salt which is exorcized and blessed for ordinary holy water may not be substituted for the baptismal salt.

WHY A FEAST OF ST. PAUL ON JUNE 30?

Question: What is the origin of the Commemoration of St. Paul on June 30, when the day before was a feast in his honor in conjunction with St. Peter?

Answer: In early medieval times, there were two Masses in Rome on June 29, one at daybreak in honor of St. Peter in the Vatican Basilica and later a second Mass in honor of St. Paul at his basilica. From about the eighth century the two were combined in the one Mass of the two Apostles. Later, since the principal emphasis in the text of the Mass of June 29 was on St. Peter, as is still the case, a special commemoration of St. Paul was arranged for the following day, with the station at his basilica.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

SUNDAY MORNING CONFESSIONS

Question: What is to be said of the obligation of pastors to have confessions in their churches on Sunday mornings? There are many different views and customs on this matter. Some priests refuse to hear any confessions in the church on Sunday morning, others hear before Mass, others hear up to the offertory, while in some churches, staffed by a large number of priests, the opportunity is given the faithful to go to the confession during the entire Mass.

Answer: Undoubtedly, there are many difficulties and inconveniences connected with the hearing of confessions regularly in our parish churches on Sunday morning. This is particularly the case in large urban parishes. The priests are kept busy with other tasks, the churches are crowded, the Masses follow one another in quick succession. It is easy to understand why, generally speaking, pastors do not favor Sunday morning confessions.

However, it is difficult to see how a pastor is justified in lay-

ing down a hard and fast rule that confessions will not be heard on Sunday morning. For a parish priest is bound in justice to hear the confessions of those of his flock who reasonably ask this service (Can. 892, § 1). Now, it is certainly a reasonable request on the part of a person who is anxious to receive Holy Communion, yet was unable to get to confession Saturday afternoon or evening, to ask to receive the sacrament of Penance on Sunday morning.

It cannot be denied that in practically every parish in the United States there are people who have a just reason for going to confession on Sunday morning. In the country parishes there are always some who live a great distance from the church and who could not make the long journey on Saturday and again on Sunday. In the city parishes there are some who have to work on Saturday afternoon and evening. It would seem to be a grave neglect of the pastoral ministry if a parish priest regularly refuses such persons the opportunity of confessing on Sunday morning.

Of course, there will be abuses if confessions are heard regularly on Sunday morning. Some, who could easily come to confession the previous day will take advantage of this opportunity to "streamline" their devotions, by receiving both Penance and the Holy Eucharist in the briefest possible time. However, the fact that there will be some abuses does not exempt the priest from a duty so important as giving deserving members of his flock the opportunity of confessing their sins on the only occasion available to them. The priest is, indeed, fully justified in taking measures to limit the Sunday morning confessions to those who cannot come the day before. He can frequently announce that the opportunity is intended only for such members of the parish, and even personally admonish those who he knows are transgressing this ruling. In a small parish where there are very few persons who have not the opportunity to confess on Saturday, he can even wait for individual requests before entering the confessional. But in a parish where there is a considerable number of persons able to come to confession only on Sunday morning there should be a regular time assigned for the confessions of any who present themselves.

The most desirable system is to have confessions before the Mass; and naturally this is the only procedure possible where only one priest is available. It is interesting in this connection to recall that the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore exhorted

pastors to be on hand for confessions, not only on Saturdays and the vigils of Feasts, but also on Sundays and Feast days in the morning before the first Mass (*Conc. Plen. Balt. II Acta et decreta* [Baltimore, 1868] n. 291). This sentence was added: "It would be a most grave crime if through the negligence or sloth of a pastor even one of the faithful were deprived of this sacrament."

Where there are several priests and the Masses are close together an effort should be made to have all the confessions heard at least before the offertory. For, it is a disputed point whether or not a person going to confession can at the same time be considered as hearing Mass (cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1947], I, n. 527; Prümmer, *Manuale theologiae moralis* [Friburg Brisgov., 1935], II, n. 491). At any rate, if the confession is going on at the time of consecration, the priest should suggest to the penitent that he pause and center his attention on this most solemn portion of the Holy Sacrifice.

LAY PARTICIPATION IN THE MASS

Question: What is to be said of the custom which has arisen in recent years of printing on the invitation to a First Mass such words as "Fr. X invites you to offer with him his First Solemn Mass"?

Answer: Although the laity can be said to *offer* the Mass in a correct though broad sense of the term, it is certainly not advisable to use this verb at the same time for both priest and people. For this is likely to give the impression that the difference in the act of offering the Holy Sacrifice between the lay person and the ordained priest is one of degree only—and that is incorrect. There is an essential difference in the mode, too. This point was brought out very clearly by Pope Pius XII in his recent encyclical, *Mediator Dei:*

> It is necessary, in order to avoid giving rise to a dangerous error, that we define the exact meaning of the word "offer." The unbloody immolation at the words of consecration, when Christ is made present upon the altar in the state of a victim, is performed by the priest and by him alone, as the representative of Christ and not as the representative of the faithful. . . .The faithful offer the sacrifice by the hands of the priest from the fact that the minister at the altar, in offering a sacrifice in the name of all His members, represents Christ, the

Head of the Mystical Body; hence the whole Church can rightly be said to offer up the victim through Christ. But the conclusion that the people offer the sacrifice with the priest himself is not based on the fact that, being members of the Church, no less than the priest himself, they perform a visible, liturgical rite; for this is the privilege only of the minister who has been divinely appointed to this office: rather it is based on the fact that the people unite their hearts in praise, impetration, expiation and thanksgiving with the prayers or intention of the priest (*Mediator Dei,* tr. *Catholic Mind,* June, 1948, p. 353).

In view of the false notions the use of the word "offer" is likely to engender when applied to the laity and the priest together, it is undoubtedly inadvisable to invite lay Catholics "to offer the Holy Sacrifice with Fr. X." It would be much better, in view of the instruction of the Holy Father, to say "Fr. X invites you to join with him as he offers his First Solemn Mass."

CONFIRMATION ADMINISTERED BY A PASTOR

Question: Please state if the power to confirm, recently granted by the Holy See to pastors, if a bishop is not available, may be used in these cases (presuming, of course, that the persons in question have never been confirmed): (1) a Catholic in danger of death from an accident; (2) a Catholic in danger of death, and now unconscious; (3) a negligent Catholic, unconscious and in danger of death. Also, in the event that the pastor is in doubt as to his power to confirm in certain cases, would be, by performing the ceremony of Confirmation, incur the penalties laid down in Canon 2365 for those who dare to confirm without delegation or who presume to go beyond the limits of the faculty they have been granted?

Answer: (1) Although the decree in question asserted that the pastor can confirm only one who is in a real danger of death from a grave disease (*morbo*), it is morally certain that this phase includes a person who is in such danger from a wound or an accident. (Cf. *AER,* CXVI, 4 [April, 1947], 260).

(2) Supposing the requisite conditions to be present, a person can be confirmed by virtue of the decree in question even after he has lost consciousness. It is true, if he is an adult, he must have at least the habitual intention of receiving Confirmation; but in the

case of one who has lived a Catholic life, such an intention is reasonable presumed to be present from the very fact that he is devoted to his religious practices.

(3) Even one who has been careless in the practice of the Catholic religion can usually be presumed to have the intention of receiving Confirmation in danger of death, because such a person generally has the intention of accepting whatever spiritual aids the Church will offer him in that crisis. Of course, if he had previously made a positive intention to the contrary he could not be confirmed, but Catholics rarely go to that length, however negligent they may be. If there is reason to doubt the intention of a Catholic deprived of consciousness at the approach of death, the priest could administer to sacrament conditionally ("Si vis Confirmationem recipere").

With regard to the last section of the question, even if a priest has some doubt when he administers Confirmation as to whether or not he is acting validly, he would not incur the penalties mentioned in Canon 2365. For, the first of these is only *ferendae sententiae,* and besides, the expressions used in regard to both penalties (*ausus fuerit . . . praesumpserit*) indicate a very definite knowledge that one is not acting validly, not a mere doubt (Canon 2229, §2). At any rate, no pastor need have any hesitation in employing the faculty to confirm in the cases mentioned by the questioner.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MARY OUR PATTERN OF FAITH

Mary is our pattern of Faith, both in the reception and in the study of Divine Truth. She does not think it enough to accept, she dwells upon it; not enough to possess, she uses it; not enough to assent, she develops it; not enough to submit the Reason, she reasons upon it; not indeed reasoning first, and believing afterwards, with Zacharias, yet first believing without reasoning, next from love and reverence, reasoning after believing.

—John Henry Cardinal Newman, *Oxford University Sermons* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), p. 313.

Book Review

THINKING IT OVER. By Thomas F. Woodlock. Edited and with Introduction by James Edward Tobin. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Company, 1947. Pp. xiv + 288. $3.00.

Thinking It Over is a collection of more than one hundred papers of Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock which appeared originally in the *Wall Street Journal.* In a clear-cut and concise manner he covers a wide range of subjects including Society, Democracy, Law, Education, Economics, and War and Peace. He displays a wide acquaintance with these topics and handles them in a scholarly manner. His treatment of free enterprise and democracy is of special interest.

Mr. Woodlock is a fluent writer and well able to carry his readers along with him as he discourses on these subjects of vital interest to all thinking people of today. Very aptly he avers that to have peace today we must have a "unifying ideal," one which has its principles of life in "religion," and "there can be no *peace* until then."

In one of the papers in the first chapter of the book on the general subject of *Society—Isms and Idols,* he gives a clear picture of Russia as he found it in a brochure entitled *The Constitution of the U.S.S.R.* This brochure is being circulated by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship Incorporated and Mr. Woodlock questions the amount of close reading which is being given to it. As the brochure describes Russia she is a federation of sixteen autonomous republics in which state, church, and schools are entirely separated. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens. But the "Constitution's terms as they stand in this brochure do not guarantee freedom of religion as we understand it in this country" (p. 60).

He gives an excellent summation of democracy on p. 91 where he states that a workable democracy requires two essential qualities in the people who chose it as a way of life. "One is a deep sense of the dignity inherent in human personality—and particularly in the 'other' person. The other is an equally keen sense of the natural hierarchy existing among men." Kinship with the spiritual, he says on p. 91, is a necessity for true democracy.

He sums up our United States Constitution as the "body and the letter" of the "spirit and the thought" of our doctrine of inalienable rights.

Mr. Woodlock challenges "Science and the Moral Order" as treated in the Rockefeller Foundation's annual report for 1940. He deplores the lack of distinction in the report between scientific *method* and the

matter of physical science (p. 170). He opines that there should be a clearly defined frontier separating the knowledge of *science* and the knowledge of the *moral order.*

A lengthy index of names indicates that the author had read widely His quotations from numerous other authors and deep thinkers lend a scholarly tone to the book.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

WHERE IS TRUTH? By Elizabeth T. Britt. Introduction by Francis Cardinal Spellman. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947. Pp. 322. $3.00.

In this book, Mother Britt, who was in charge of the schools of the Religious of the Sacred Heart in Tokyo, Japan, for some years prior to Dec. 8, 1941, has given us a thorough, readable, and logical statement of Catholic teaching. Priests in charge of converts who need something more than "the penny catechism" to instruct and convince their charges will find it a God-send. Because of its arrangements with questions and study topics at the end of each chapter, it lends itself admirably for use as a text for late high school or for college courses in religion. Lively in style, yet serious and competent in tone, it may, without the slightest hesitancy, be placed in the hands of Catholics or non-Catholics for independent reading, as a solid exposition of the case for the Catholic Church, its doctrine, moral teaching, and inspirational force.

In fifteen chapters, the basic teachings of the Church are outlined, with frequent reference to historical backgrounds, contemporary problems, and practical implications related to these claims and principles. Following an examination of the meaning and purpose of life, the question of revelation is examined, together with a study of the authenticity and credibility of the gospels. The meaning of the Blessed Trinity is satisfactorily expounded. The creation of the universe, of angels, and of man are presented in order, and the consequences of original sin are related to the redemption by Christ, as opposed to the philosophies of Epicurus, Buddha, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche.

The foundation of the Catholic Church, its visible nature and mission, and its position face to face with Protestantism and "broadmindedness" are discussed amply and frankly, but without the slightest offense. The sacramental system and the spirit of love as dominating the New Testament and taught by the Church bring the book to an inspiring close. A glossary of Catholic expressions and key terms, an excellent bibliography, including history and comment on the Protestant Reforma-

tion, and an adequate index contribute notably to the value of the book. This volume deserves a wide circulation.

JAMES A. MAGNER

BOURKE COCKRAN: A FREE LANCE IN AMERICAN POLITICS. By James McGurrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. Pp. 361. $3.50.

The grand tradition of William Bourke Cockran has been gradually fading from the memories of American Catholics and James McGurrin has done a distinct service to American Catholicism and to American politics by this pleasant, readable biography. If there is one great need of American Catholicism today, it is leadership in the field of politics. There are some Catholics in Congress and in state and local politics but scarcely any one of them can be depended upon for a Catholic interpretation of current political problems. Particularly one looks in vain for a Catholic political leader to give an explanation of the present church and state crisis which would be worth hearing because of the character and learning of the speaker.

Perhaps Cockran had an ideal preparation—an Irish Catholic childhood and French and classical education. The progressive education that is invading contemporary Catholic education could not provide either the discipline or the content of his education. Truly this education fashioned better than ordinary material in memory, imagination, good humor and voice. Even his physique was a special talent. One might suggest that despite his lack of reverence for his father he also inherited some of his father's carelessness about material gain which flowered in Bourke Cockran as Christian disinterestedness.

Mr. McGurrin lets the flowing sentences of Cockran tell much of his narrative, adding the glowing praise of Cockran's many admirers. This leads to a bit of shallowness in interpretation and an absence of many details which the more prosy historian might find important. Cockran's boast that he always paid his way naturally leads to some question about the source of this abundant income and about the character of his bar experiences, which for the most part remain unanswered. There are also some strange actions of this independent politician which invite close scrutiny. One might have difficulty combining his campaign for McKinley and his defense of Tom Mooney, or his attitude on the Fifteenth Amendment with his friendship for Negroes, or his love of politics with his disregard for bosses.

Perhaps, it is these inconsistencies in Bourke Cockran that mark him as the supreme politician—the type of politician which, if it were common, could redeem the name. The contrast between Bourke Cock-

ran and William Allen White lies in just this ability of Cockran to judge the situation and courageously carry out his convictions. Where White found excuses for his consistency Cockran changed his position to suit his unchanging principles. In all this he was above all courageous. Perhaps the age in which Bourke Cockran could hold audiences for hours at a time is passed, but the present America could well use his intelligence, his wit, and his deep learning to provide a needed Catholic voice in the maelstrom of voices now attempting to give the answer to our post-war (or pre-war) problems.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY, C.S.C.

NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL WEDLOCK: A LENTEN COURSE OF SEVEN SERMONS. By Rev. Clement H. Crock. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1948. Pp. 64. $1.50.

The sanctity of Christian marriage and the Catholic blueprint of family life constitute the key ideas of this noteworthy collection of discourses. In these post-war days, when the Christian family, together with the divinely-wrought moral principles upon which it has been builded, finds itself in grave peril both at home and abroad, Fr. Crock's latest series is timely indeed. Though the problems which these institutions encounter may be many and varied, in each case their Catholic solution lies in the ample use of the sacramental graces provided by the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Since the Creator has ordained that the greater portion of the human race shall attain eternal destiny through the vehicle of marriage, He must also have charted the highway thereto with unchanging regulations, besides surrounding the vehicle itself with safeguards appropriate to its continued well-being. These basic facts provide the theme of the first three sermons. Against a backdrop formed by the *Arcanum divinae* of Leo XIII, the *Casti connubii* of Pius XI, and the liturgy of the Nuptial Mass, marriage is well limned as a trinity of partnership involving man, wife and God.

The next three sermons present the divine and the ecclesiastical regulations of marriage, with particular emphasis upon the undermining abuses peculiar to modern civilization.

In the final sermon, the author's treatment of single life in the world, recently called by the Holy Father, "the mysterious vocation," is particularly worthy of praise.

Written in simple forthright language, and sprinkled with many apt illustrations, the message of these sermons is forceful and convincing. They should serve very well the busy priest.

EDWARD F. DOWD

OLD ST. PATRICK'S: NEW YORK'S FIRST CATHEDRAL. By Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O.S.U. New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, Monograph Series, XXIII, 1947. Pp. 111.

It is good to see one of the pioneer churches of American Catholicism saved from oblivion. The story of the second parish in New York City from 1809 to 1879, while its church served as the cathedral of the diocese, is told in this monograph. While Mother Peter has done this from archival sources and from accounts in the religious and secular press, her scientific approach has not detracted in the least from the easy flow of her style.

The "old" cathedral is not an uncommon phenomenon in the United States. When Archbishop Hughes with such happy folly and unequaled vision moved his chair of authority to the present Fifth Avenue location it was protested that it was too far out of the city. There remained downtown on Mott Street Old St. Patrick's which still functions vigorously as a parish church among the tenements of a predominantly Italian neighborhood, although it remains unsought by admiring visitors. Yet it had seventy years of great splendor and importance in which are found some great men and colorful events. There was Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., to whom the author gives most credit for the building of the original edifice, and Bishop Cheverus of Boston who accepted the invitation to consecrate it when the appointed bishop's arrival was uncertain. The troubles of trusteeism from within the flock and of nativism without had to be faced by Bishops John Connolly and John Dubois, but it remained for Hughes to break the back of the former and to dampen the fire of the latter by rallying his Irish parishioners to protect their cathedral by force if necessary. Not only these events but the rector who caused a lull in the trustee quarrel by retiring to work for a while as an engineer on the Croton acqueduct, the calamitous fire of 1866 which left only the walls standing, and the investiture of the first American cardinal, John McCloskey—all these and more find a place in the story of New York's first cathedral.

If the author has failed at times to convey the feeling that beyond administrative problems and ecclesiastical panoply there was a living body of faithful laity—which is true especially of the thinnest section covering the period 1838-78—it is hardly to be laid at her door. One can hardly capture that reality from the available records of trustee meetings, but only from such non-extant sources as parish announcements or private papers. It is another example of how the almost complete lack of parish archives adversely affects the writing of church history on that level.

What has been presented in this book, nevertheless, may well serve as a plea and a model for serious—and still readable— parish histories,

of which we may expect more as parochial centenaries become more commonplace. This reviewer found but two references which might have well been further identified. One concerned the "remarkable Vergil Barber" (p.23), a prominent convert of the early century, and the other the "fourth church," (p. 58) in New York City, which was apparently Transfiguration, established in 1827.

HENRY J. BROWNE

THE HUMAN WISDOM OF ST. THOMAS. Arranged by Joseph Pieper. Translated by Drostan MacLaren, O.P. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1948. Pp. xii + 111. $2.00.

This small volume is rightly regarded by its editor as a breviary of the philosophy of St. Thomas. It contains nothing which is theology in the strict sense of the term. It is evident from a perusal of the texts selected that this philosophy is definitely linked to theology and leads to a fuller appreciation of Faith.

There is no attempt made by the editor to give a commentary on the texts selected. Rather does he wish the reader to meditate on these passages for himself and become acquainted in an elementary way with the form and design of the whole Thomistic system. The texts have been selected through personal choice and were intended mainly for the circle of friends of the editor. It is not desirable that the book be read from beginning to end at any one time, but that one or more texts, or for that matter a whole section be analyzed thoughtfully so that the reader may make the thought of St. Thomas his own and appreciate the philosophical attitude with which the texts were written by the Angelic Doctor.

Viewed as a whole the texts reveal a twofold aspect of St. Thomas' thought: the order and the mystery. The whole scheme of reality is ordered and penetrable by reason yet surrounded by mystery. The boundary between order and mystery is at once apparent. The world may be explained by the efforts of human thought yet the mystery of Being still remains.

The work is supplied with a very good index of references and with a suitable key to the abbreviations used in the index. This Thomist Breviary should serve to stimulate the general reader and the beginning student of philosophy to study further the thought of Thomas Aquinas, and to give the advanced student a better understanding of what is already familiar to him.

FRANCIS P. CASSIDY

LE CARDINAL DE BERULLE. By A. Molien, Priest of the Oratory. Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1947. Two vols., pp. 391, 395.

In writing this book Fr. Molien has a twofold purpose in mind: to render accessible a characteristic selection of the writings of this great French spiritual teacher and contemporary of Cardinal Richelieu and secondly to set forth his spiritual teaching through a systematic resume of the doctrine contained in his numerous writings.

As any proper understanding of the work of Cardinal de Berulle would be impossible without some knowledge of his life and the problems with which he was faced, Fr. Molien has very naturally introduced his study by a full biographical sketch. The work, then, is divided into three parts: the life, the doctrine, and a selection of the best texts.

Cardinal de Berulle's life was a very active one. As chaplain to the Court of France he had considerable influence in France during the first quarter of the seventeenth century, notably in connection with the Treaty of Angoulême and the siege of La Rochelle. His greatest work, however, was in the introduction of the Reformed Carmelite nuns into France and the founding of the French Oratory, which though modelled after that of St. Philip Neri is not to be confused with it.

In spite of the tremendous burden placed upon him by his Court duties, by his duties as Inspector of the French Carmelite communities and by the direction of his own Oratory, the Cardinal de Berulle found time to write considerably. These writings are for the most part connected with his active work and consist of pamphlets, instructions, letters, and some longer works, the greatest of which is probably that usually known by its shorter title of *Les Grandeurs de Jésus*. Fr. Molien has drawn his exposition of the spiritual doctrine of the Cardinal from these writings. This doctrine may be described simply by the terms "theocentric" and "Christocentric." It is translated into action by a particular devotion to the Mother of Christ and to the Angels and Saints. Almost half of Fr. Molien's book is taken up by an exposé of this doctrine with an introduction on the sources which may have influenced the thought of de Berulle and a conclusion on his influence on the later spiritual life of France. The tremendous extent of this influence may be appreciated, when one considers that St. John Eudes, St. Vincent de Paul, Jean-Jacques Olier, and St. Grignon de Montfort were all formed in his school—some of them through personal contact with de Berulle. Fr. Molien can also see the results of his influence in such great figures as Pascal and Bossuet.

The third section of the book occupies some 350 pages and is devoted to a presentation of texts from the writing of Cardinal de Berulle. This is in fulfilment of the prime purpose of the author and is undoubtedly the most valuable part of the entire book, particularly since the

great part of de Berulle's writings are inaccessible to the general reader. The texts are not arranged chronologically or according to the works from which they are taken, but rather they are arranged according to their subject matter approximately after the same plan used in the exposition of the doctrine in the second part of the book. Thus the texts chosen refer in order to the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharist, the Blessed Virgin, and the Christian Life. There follow two interesting groups of texts connected with the direction of the Oratory and of the Carmelite communities and then a group of texts on prayer and meditation. In connection with this last it is interesting to note that the Sulpician method of meditation, so-called, as distinguished from that of St. Ignatius originated with Cardinal de Berulle. The last group of texts consist of four letters on various subjects. Although all of these texts are inspiring illustrations of the thought of Cardinal de Berulle, yet possibly the most practical for an understanding of his Christocentric spiritually are those treating of the mysteries of the childhood of Jesus and included in Chapter III of this section.

The excellent choice of these texts and their orderly arrangement suggest the only criticism that might be made of Fr. Molien's book. It would seem that in view of this abundance of texts illustrating the profound spiritual doctrine of Cardinal de Berulle the second part of the book, the exposé of doctrine, is unnecessarily long and tedious. It might well have been abbreviated to half its present length without in any way diminishing the effect of the book as a whole.

In spite of the numerous studies which have appeared since the death of Cardinal de Berulle in 1629 treating both his life and his writings, nevertheless the accusations made against him during his lifetime by his enemies as well as the deliberate attempts of some after his death to belittle his work have done much to obscure his memory. Furthermore the attempts of the Jansenists to adopt him as one of their own have been cause of a certain timidity evinced by many in his regard. This latest work on Cardinal de Berulle should do much to restore him to his proper place in the history of French spirituality and to dispell any doubts which some may have entertained as to his absolute orthodoxy. The orderly and abundant exposition of the best texts from his writings, hitherto almost inaccessible, will be a great help to those who wish to profit first hand from the virile spirituality of this great Cardinal, who may be considered as the founder of the modern school of French spirituality.

F. H. Chase, Jr.

A KEY TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST. By Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B., Abbot of Buckfast. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946. Pp. xiv + 269. $2.50.

In Abbot Vonier we come in contact with a human spirit rich in faith, steeped in scholarship, and experienced in expounding truths whose sublimity he loves. It is such a spirit which is the vital force of this whole book and which causes it to be a source of intellectual and spiritual enrichment for any priest or theologian. It is small wonder that popular demand has caused it to be printed once again.

In this small volume the author covers a very wide field. He begins with the apprehension of the Real Presence through faith. From there he treats of the unique nature of the sacramental order, first in general and then specifically as regards the Eucharist. In the remaining two-thirds of the book he applies this basic sacramental principle to the various elements of the tract on the Eucharist. The positive and negative aspects of this sacramental view of the Sacrifice of the Mass are treated immediately. The author then deals with the essence, oneness, immolation, and application of the Sacrifice with due references to St. Thomas and the Council of Trent. Before closing he dwells upon the elements of transubstantiation, Eucharistic accidents, and concomitance. The book is concluded with the liturgical aspects of the Mass and its sanctifying effect on those who partake of it.

Abbot Vonier's real key to the doctrine of the Eucharist is his presentation of the unique nature of the sacramental order: it is a distinct mode of reality all its own. In it divine signification and efficacy work together so that it is a transient meeting place where the world of the material and the world of the spiritual meet in a supernatural harmony. As a result it is able to signify and also reproduce the past in its "literal reality," apart from the accidental circumstances of history. Thus Calvary and the Eucharist become suprahistorical. In applying this theme to the Mass the author agrees generically with Billot but strives for an even clearer and deeper penetration of the mystery.

Though the verve and color of the writer's style is tempered by his character as a precise theologian, his incisiveness reminds one a bit of Pierre Rousselot in *the Intellectualism of St. Thomas.* It must be admitted that De la Taille would not completely recognize his theory of the Mass as presented by Vonier. The abbot does build up a strong case for his own theory on the Sacrifice of the Mass which he presents in this book. But like all the other theories its convincing power will depend much upon the background and approach of the individual reader. No matter what school one follows this book will be a source of a much richer comprehension and love of the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

WALTER P. BURKE, C.S.P.

INTRODUZIONE ALLA PSICOLOGIA. By Agostino Gemelli and Giorgio Zunini. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1947. Pp. xv + 447. It. Lire 900.

In this volume, Fr. Gemelli, with the collaboration of Fr. G. Zunini, his assistant, has gathered together the fruits of his many years of research in the field of experimental psychology. An account of these researches was published, several years ago, by Prof. A. Manoil, a former collaborator of Fr. Gemelli, in his work: *La Psychologie expérimentale en Italie. Ecole de Milan* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1938). In the present work the author gives first a synthesis of the development of psychology since the time of its separation from philosophy three-quarters of a century ago. The emancipation of psychology from philosophy is commonly attributed to W. Wundt, who was the founder of the first laboratory for psychological research in 1879. Fr. Gemelli thinks that the credit of priority in this case must be given to Giuseppe Sergi who, three years before, in 1876, had founded a similar laboratory in Rome.

In evaluating the merits and demerits of every school of psychology the author never fails to point out the right solution of the various problems in addition or opposition to the solution given by the various schools. The American schools of Behaviorism, through J. B. Watson, and Purposive Behaviorism, through Tolman, receive special attention in this work. After recognizing their practical value, the author says that "Behaviorism is a psychology without a soul." A similar diagnosis is made by the author of a number of other materialistic schools.

The most important part of this book consists of the analysis of the many problems of psychology themselves in the light of the latest researches. Such problems are: The Activity of Conscience, Perception, Affective States, Intelligence and Will, Instinctive Behavior, Intelligent Behavior in Animals, Human Behavior, Social Behavior, Personality, etc. The reader has here a comprehensive presentation of the doctrine of modern experimental psychology. It was the intention of the author to give "a panoramic view" of psychology. The work is meant for graduate students. A textbook knowledge of the subject is presupposed. Every chapter contains a pertinent and complete bibliography. We hope that this scholarly work will soon be translated into English for the benefit of those who cannot read it in the original Italian.

PASCAL P. PARENTE